Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-050
Thursday
14 March 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-050 CONTENTS *14 March 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: As of 13 March 1991, Moscow domestic radio sourcelines in the DAILY REPORT will reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" designation in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new radio sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Compliance With Confidence Measures Urged *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Mar]* 1

WARSAW PACT RELATIONS

Shifts in USSR-E. Europe Relationship Viewed *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reportage on Churkin 13 March Briefing 7
CEMA, Mediterranian Issues 7
Mideast Security Diplomacy Continues 7
Comments on Salvadoran Elections 7
SRV Statement on Cambodia Supported 8
CSCE Forum Discusses Communications Network *[TASS]* 8
International Construction Conference Previewed *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Baker Visit Previewed, Mideast Focus Noted 10
To Meet Gorbachev 15 Mar *[Moscow Radio]* 10
Both Seek Mideast Resolution *[Moscow International]* 10
Both Seek 'New World Order' *[Moscow International]* 10
Gulf Issues Highlight Differences *[TASS]* 11
Churkin Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 11
Baker's Mideast Tour Shows Peace Prospects *[Moscow International]* 12
Controversy Continues Over Embassy in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 12 Mar]* 13

China

Maslyukov Heads Economic Delegation to Beijing *[Moscow TV]* 13
Rogachev Holds Talks in Beijing 11-13 Mar *[Moscow International]* 14
China's Policy Change on Cambodia Dims Peace Hopes *[Moscow International]* 14

Northeast Asia

Team Spirit Exacerbates DPRK, ROK Tension *[Moscow International]* 15
Commentary Assesses DPRK-Japan Talks on Ties *[Moscow International]* 15

Near East & South Asia

Military Expert Views Iraqi Gulf War Losses *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 16
Dzasokhov Meets With Syrian Enovy in Moscow *[TASS]* 19
Minister Sums Up Damascus Economic Talks *[Moscow International]* 19
Deputy Defense Minister Visits India *[TASS]* 19

East Europe

CSFR Anti-Soviet Campaign Marks Europe Shifts *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Mar]* 19
Troop Withdrawals From Hungary Talks Continue *[TASS]* 21

West Europe

European Bank President Meets With Leaders 21
Discusses Ties With Gorbachev *[TASS]* 21
Meets With Pavlov *[TASS]* 21
Belonogov, EC Ambassadors Discuss Gulf Peace *[TASS]* 22
Shevardnadze Makes Statement on USSR in Italy *[TASS]* 22
French Official Reports on Humanitarian Aid *[PRAVDA 8 Mar]* 22
Military Inspectors Arrive in Norway 12 Mar *[TASS]* 22
Nuclear Test Consultations Held With Finns *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* 22

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Appoints Security Council Members *[Moscow TV]* 23
Article Defends Gorbachev's Centrist Course *[IZVESTIYA 12 Mar]* 23
Gorbachev Receives Church Representatives *[TASS]* 24
Muslim Mufti Sends Message to Patriarch *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 24
Moscow Pickets Support Striking Miners *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 25
Procurator General Trubin on Referendum Law *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 9 Mar]* 25
Referendum 'No' Vote Considered Illogical *[PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 26
Democratic Rallies Considered Subversive *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 28
Vocal Anti-Union Anarchists Criticized *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 29
Ethnic Germans Decide To Hold Congress *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 29
Forum Begins in Moscow *[TASS]* 30
Congress Appeals to Pavlov *[TASS]* 30
Ryzhkov, Pavlov Interviews Contrasted *[Moscow TV]* 30
TSN Anchorman on News Censorshop *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 35
Three Presidents' Powers Compared *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 35
Cabinet Asks Country To Collect Scrap Metal *[PRAVDA 5 Mar]* 38

Economic

Kuzbass Hunger Strikers Demand Gorbachev Resign *[TASS]* 38
Gorbachev Given 1 April Deadline *[TASS]* 39
22 Mines on Strike in Kuzbass *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Coalfield Joins Strike *[Moscow TV]* 39
Area Strike Update *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Miners Union Leader Calls Strikers 'Enemies' *[Moscow TV]* 39
Muscovites Show Symbolic Support *[Moscow TV]* 40
Regional Economic Links Not Succeeding *[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]* 40
Trade Union Sends Letter to Leadership *[TRUD 12 Mar]* 41

Agricultural

Pavlov Visits Agro-Industrial Complex *[Moscow TV]* 42
Kazakhstan Able to Sell Other Republics Grain *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Polozkov on Agricultural Difficulties *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 6 Mar]* 43
Early March Weather, Crop Conditions *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 7 Mar]* 46

Scientific

Tyumen Officials Warn of Impending Energy Crisis *[TASS]* 46
Satellite Communications System Projected *[Moscow TV]* 47
Limited Funds Hamper Antipollution Measures *[Moscow TV]* 47

Military

Defense Ministry Interviewed on Referendum *[Moscow TV]* 48
Politburo's Stroyev at Railroad Troop Conference *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 51
General Wins Law Suit For Defamation *[TASS]* 51
Transcaucasus District Disarmament Department *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Mar]* 51
Artillery Marshal on Equipment, Cutback Problems *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Poll on Attitudes Toward Army Reported *[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]* 52

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Assistance Funds Demanded From Baltic Republics *[Riga Radio]* 54
Estonian Commissions Prepare for Referendum *[Tallinn Radio]* 54
Estonian Legislature Rejects Treaty Discussion *[TASS]* 54
OMON Warns of Latvian Plan To Seize TV Center *[Riga Radio]* 54
Latvian Pro-Referendum Groups Coordinate Efforts *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 7 Mar]* 54
Latvian Legislators Calls for Referendum *[TASS]* 55
Faction Alleges Breaches in Latvia Poll Procedure *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 5 Mar]* 55
Latvian CP Bureau on Commitment to 'Dialogue' *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 27 Feb]* 57
Latvian CP Bureau Statement Opposes 3 Mar Poll *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 26 Feb]* 57
Latvian Ministers 6 Mar Meeting Reported *[Riga Radio]* 58
Latvian Public Security Chief Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 21 Feb]* 58
Baltic Military Council Protests Terrorist Act *[IZVESTIYA 8 Mar]* 60
Inspectors Complete Check on Latvian Arms Depot *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 60
German Delegation Views Visit, Leaves Riga *[Riga Radio]* 60
India Rejects Direct Contacts With Latvia *[TASS]* 60
Latvia Establishes Migration Quota Structure *[Riga International]* 61
Lithuania Sees 'Danger' in Troop Movements 61
Union Denies Increased Presence *[TASS]* 61
Pullout From Germany 'Great Danger' *[Hamburg DPA]* 61
Would Mean 'Enormous Concentration' *[Berlin ADN]* 61
Soviet Military Refuses Talks With Lithuania *[Vilnius International]* 61
Customs Building Blown Up in Lithuania 11 Mar *[TASS]* 62
Explosion Noted at Vilnius Commander's Office *[Radio Vilnius]* 62
Lithuanian Government Statement on Referendum *[EKHO LITVY 27 Feb]* 62
TASS Reports Lukyanov Cable to Landsbergis 62
IZVESTIYA on Vilnius Referendum Plans *[12 Mar]* 63
Lithuanians Urged 'Not To Contribute' to Poll *[Radio Vilnius]* 64
Lithuania's Burokevicius Attacks Economic Policy *[Moscow International]* 64
PRAVDA Interviews Burokevicius *[5 Mar]* 64
Lithuanian Government Adopts Food Rationing *[Radio Vilnius]* 66
Baltic Commander's Protest Over Fight Rejected *[EKHO LITVY 22 Feb]* 67
Norway Awards Landsbergis 'People's Peace Prize'
[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 12 Mar] 67

RSFSR

Yeltsin Says USSR Civil War 'Unthinkable' *[TASS]* 67
Yeltsin Sees No Reconciliation With Gorbachev *[Hamburg BILD 14 Mar]* 68
Yeltsin Seeks Live TV Spot on Referendum *[TASS]* 68
Denied Live Air Time *[TASS]* 68
Russian CP Issues Appeal on Union Referendum *[TASS]* 68
Moscow Radio Reports Appeal 69
Moscow's Prokofyev on Union Referendum's Aims *[TASS]* 69
Oryol Region Councils Reject Russian Referendum *[TASS]* 69
Bashkir Legislature Views Upcoming Referendums *[Moscow Radio]* 70
Democratic Party Urges 'No' Vote on Referendum *[Radio Rossii]* 70
Khasbulatov Views Union, RSFSR Referendums *[Moscow TV]* 70
Khasbulatov Comments on Yeltsin Speech, Treaty *[Radio Rossii]* 72

Procurator: No Prosecution for Combining Posts *[Moscow TV]* 74
Prokofyev Sees No Need for RSFSR President *[Moscow TV]* 75
Prosecutor Says Yeltsin Remarks 'Inaccurate' *[Moscow International]* 75
'Union of Russian Cities' Created in Moscow *[TASS]* 75
Leningrad's Sobchak Meets With ROK President *[Moscow TV]* 76

Western Republics

Belorussian Televised Legislature Debates End *[IZVESTIYA 5 Mar]* 76
New Draft Law Affects Belorussian Militia 77
Rights, Protections Guaranteed *[PRAVDA 27 Feb]* 77
Raises Turned Down *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Former Belorussian Defense Enterprise Converted *[Kiev Radio]* 77
Army Role in Referendum Questioned in Moldova 78
Union Official: Serves as 'Organizer' *[TASS]* 78
More Troops Seen on Eve of Vote *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Mar]* 78
People's Front Blocks Polling Station in Moldova *[TASS]* 78
Moldovan Communist Party Head Discusses Poll *[PRAVDA 9 Mar]* 79
Sociologists Survey Opinions in Moldova *[TASS]* 79
Railroad Workers Threaten Mine Countermeasures *[Kiev International]* 80
Ukrainians Hear Opposing Views on Referendum *[Moscow TV]* 80
Ukraine Oblasts Add Questions to Referendum *[Moscow Radio]* 80
Gen Gromov Sues Paper Over Coup Allegations *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* 81
Radiation Monitoring System Developed in Ukraine *[Moscow TV]* 81

Caucasus

Armenian Deputy Rejects Lukyanov Poll Appeal *[Yerevan International]* 81
Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Criticizes Referendum *[Yerevan Radio]* 82
Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Views Current Issues 82
Urges Vote for Secession *[PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 82
Seeks End to Republic Conflicts *[Yerevan Radio]* 83
On Hopes for Independent Georgia *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Feb]* 83
Gamsakhurdia Comments Said To Harm Stability *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 85
Prosecutor's Ruling on Tbilisi Killings Decried *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Mar]* 87
Ossetia Interethnic, Economic Crises Continue *[IZVESTIYA 12 Mar]* 87

Central Asia

Kazakh President Discusses Referendum Question *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Kazakhstan Changes Referendum Question Wording *[TASS]* 88
New Kazakh 'Democratic Bloc' Formed, Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 88
Kazakh President's Decree on Draftee Protection *[IZVESTIYA 5 Mar]* 89
Kazakh Trade Unions Plan 'Protest' 30 March *[IZVESTIYA 7 Mar]* 89
Kazakh, Uzbek Presidents Discuss Joint Policies *[Moscow TV]* 89
Uzbek CP Plenum Discusses Referendum, Other Issues *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 90
President Karimov Discusses Uzbek Concerns *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Mar]* 90

Compliance With Confidence Measures Urged

91WC0077B Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel B. Tretyakov: "Trust Must Be Mutual"]

[Text] **Under conditions of the actual termination of activity of the Warsaw Pact Organization's military structure, particular urgency is attached to safeguarding the security of Europe outside the military bloc framework, when the security of each state is seen as a component of all-European security. A most important instrument of realizating these goals is the common set of mechanisms for confidence-building measures, both those that have already evolved and those that are newly taking shape on the basis of the Paris agreements. And not only a display of good will but also the responsible attitude of each participating state toward implementation of the measures of its military activity are required here.**

There has been animated discussion in Norway of late regarding the stimulation of the USSR's military activity on the Kola peninsula which has allegedly been observed. Thus Defense Minister J. Holst declared that the biggest exercise ever conducted in the Soviet-Norwegian border area has been planned for 1991. Concern over holding the above exercise was expressed by Foreign Minister T. Stoltenberg in an interview on Norwegian radio.

Other statements are being heard also. Their essence amounts to a reanimation of the idea, which had begun to wither away, of the continuation of a "Soviet military threat." In addition, the Soviet Union is being accused of a dangerous buildup of its military power. The corresponding conclusion is being drawn also—the USSR cannot be trusted on military matters.

I would like in this connection to emphasize the following.

As far as the USSR's military activity in North Europe and the adjacent sea areas is concerned, we have not, indeed, conducted large-scale military activities in the Soviet-Norwegian border region since 1968. At the same time, however, three NATO Joint Armed Forces Bar Frost exercises (United States, Britain, Norway, the Netherlands), two Team Work exercises (United States, Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, the FRG, Denmark, Belgium, Canada, Spain, Portugal), two Cold Winter exercises (United States, Britain, Norway, the Netherlands) and others, in each of which from 13,000 to 40,000 men, from 20 to 200 ships, and from 80 to 500 aircraft took part, were conducted on the territory of northern Norway directly adjoining the border with the USSR in 1988-1990 alone.

It is true also that the plans of notifiable military activity of the USSR envisage the organization in 1991 of operational-tactical exercises among the forces of the Leningrad Military District, involving 17,000 men from three motorized infantry divisions. But this does not mean that all the forces involved will be transferred to the Pechenga region. The operations of the motorized infantry divisions will be joined by a common concept, and the training assignments may be carried out in practice within the framework of the current training centers and proving grounds near where the units are permanently based. In accordance with a provision of the Stockholm Conference document, all participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) have been notified of the exercise in good time. Invitations to foreign observers, who will be able to see for themselves the nonthreatening nature of the military activity being performed, will be sent out within the specified timeframe.

At the same time, I consider it necessary to emphasize that the Soviet Union treats with all due responsibility its participation in the process of confidence-building measures in the military sphere. Let us address the facts and at the same time see whether all parties have an appropriate concept of this process.

Commitments were assumed at the 1986 Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Security and Disarmament Measures in Europe on notification of one's military activity to all the other parties to the CSCE in instances where no fewer than 13,000 men or 300 tanks participated and also where at least 3,000 men took part in an amphibious assault landing or an airborne assault landing. The participants undertook to invite foreign military observers in instances where the numbers of forces participating in the activities amounted to or exceeded 17,000 ground force personnel or 5,000 men in an airdrop or amphibious assault landing. Each participant in the CSCE acquired the right to conduct inspections of military activity on the territory of any other participant in the zone of application of the confidence-building and security measures.

Complying with the agreements that were reached, the Soviet Union has since 1987 notified all states of the organization of 47 measures of military activity (and this number has been declining from year to year here: 18 notifiable exercises were conducted in 1987, 16 in 1988, nine in 1989, and in 1990 only four), to 15 of which observers were invited. In this same period of time, the NATO countries conducted 46 large-scale exercises, at 25 of which observers were present. Inspection groups of the USSR monitored 15 exercises, and NATO groups, 23 (10 on the territory of the USSR, 13 in the groups of forces).

Adhering strictly to the propositions of defensive doctrine and abiding by the letter and spirit of the agreements that have been reached, the Soviet Union has reduced considerably both the number and the scale of its exercises on land, at sea, and in the air. Whereas in 1986 over 40 activities at the operational-tactical level were conducted in the USSR Armed Forces, in 1990 their number declined more than fivefold. In the course of these, no less than 50 percent of the time was allotted

to the rehearsal of defense matters, 25 percent to the rehearsal of counterattack operations, and a further 25 to regrouping and transfer.

Previously, depending on the situation, up to 15 submarines and 22 surface ships were on assignment in the Mediterranean; now, it is six or seven warships. In the Indian Ocean, the number of Soviet warships has been reduced from 14-17 to three to five. We have not in recent years been sending our submarines to waters off the West Coast of the United States. We have also undertaken, as of 1990, to give notice of large-scale strategic exercises with the participation of heavy bombers.

The average number of participants in notifiable-level exercises in the USSR is within the 13,000-17,000-man range—one full division with reinforcement assets or two or three understrength divisions with operational-tactical command and control echelon elements. The organization of exercises of this scale emphasizes the Soviet Union's effort to desist from the threatening nature of military activity and a show of force, does not require a large amount of territory, and makes it possible to rehearse in full defensive assignments in the areas of the current proving grounds.

As far, however, as the military activity of the NATO Joint Armed Forces is concerned, even under the conditions of a reduction in the overall number of measures of notifiable military activity, the intensity of the operational and combat training continues, on the whole, at the level of past years and exceeds it even in terms of a number of indicators, which is a consequence of an increase in the scale of the exercises. Thus the average number of personnel participating in each exercise constitutes 26,000-29,000 men, and the number of "man-days" in 1988, for example, compared with 1987 increased from 5.3 million to 7.1 million. Although the number of tanks enlisted in the exercises declined in this period by a factor of more than 1.5, the number of "tank-days" remained almost unchanged—62,000 and 60,500—and the number of aircraft sorties almost doubled.

In addition, the system of operational and combat training of the armies of Western countries has undergone appreciable changes in recent years. A considerable part of the activities is carried out at the battalion-brigade level, which makes it possible to conduct the field training of servicemen, subunits and units at exercises of a non-notifiable level. Command-staff exercises and computer games are conducted at levels from a division up, as a rule, making it possible to rehearse to a sufficient extent questions of the command and control of the groupings of forces that have been created.

It is appropriate to mention that not everyone always has an identical understanding either of such categories as trust and openness upon the exercise of military activity. At the exercises of Soviet forces, the foreign observer guests have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the operations of the combat formations, units, and subunits upon performance of their set assignments. Such openness enables each of those present to draw objective conclusions concerning the nature of the military activity being conducted and the extent of its possible threat to other states.

At the same time, however, examples of another approach to this matter could also be given. In September 1990 the Norwegian Government invited foreign observers to a stage of the NATO Joint Armed Forces Team Work-90 assault landing exercise. The program provided for observation of an Anglo-Dutch marine brigade assault landing. But the observers were not accorded an opportunity to see the operations of the combat units, despite the requests of the guests and even an official protest on the part of the Swiss representative. And this was not the sole example of such "openness." The concept of the exercises and the assignments of the forces taking part are concealed, as a rule, from the observers at the NATO Joint Armed Forces exercises, and the demonstration of practical operations is confined to showing small technical and rear support and maintenance subunits.

Mention should also be made of the fact that confidence-building and supervisory measures have yet to encompass either military activity on the territory of the United States and Canada or the activity of the air and naval forces, that is, the components of the armed forces in respect of which the United States and NATO, as a whole, have considerable superiority to the USSR.

None of this can fail to prompt certain thoughts and conclusions. Trust must be mutual. It could become such if all participants in the all-European process were to scrupulously comply with the agreements concerning the military sphere. And if the confidence-building and supervisory measures were to extend to all aspects of the military activity of each state without exception.

Shifts in USSR-E. Europe Relationship Viewed

PM1403110191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[Valeriy Musatov article under the rubric "Political Scientist's Reflections": "East Europe: 'Typhoon' of Change"]

[Text] More than a year has passed since the tumultuous events in East Europe. A typhoon of rapid changes rushed across the region and seemingly monolithic ruling regimes collapsed. Predictions were not easy to make, but they have all been borne out. Now much has become clear regarding both the character of the changes and the prospect for development of the East European countries as well as the possible framework of the Soviet Union's cooperation with them.

This problem has particularly caught Soviet people's attention. After all, our countries shared the same geopolitical space for ages and were closely linked throughout the postwar period. The USSR invested major resources in this region. Nor should it be forgotten that hundreds of thousands of Soviet servicemen gave their lives liberating the East European countries from fascism.

The new situation requires consideration and analysis from the viewpoint of our long-term interests. At the end of January the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat discussed the development of the situation in East Europe and our policy in that region. First it was noted that the political and ideological face of East Europe has undergone a qualitative change. The old power system has been destroyed, and in most countries the former ruling parties have disintegrated or been consigned to the garbage heap of political life. Coalitions of opposition forces have come to power. Present changes are moving toward the replacement of the state and social system, and the scale of recognized social values is being perceptibly transformed. The orientation of those countries' foreign policy is changing all the more.

What are the reasons for these changes? Opinions have more or less crystallized on this score. The changes are primarily the result of a combined effect of the crisis processes which gripped all the countries of "real socialism" in the late seventies and early eighties. The administrative-command system of socialism with its characteristic fusion of party and state structures, mobilized economy, and restrictions on democracy and freedom of speech led nowhere. Whereas the national economy in East Europe was soon restored after World War II thanks to the system of state socialism, comparatively high rates of development were achieved, and strategic parity with the West in the defense sphere was ensured in the seventies, subsequently the defects of the model increasingly took their toll. This was shown most clearly in a lag in the sphere of the economy, scientific and technical progress, and living standards.

Despite the variety of reasons for the collapse of the post-Stalinist model of socialism in East Europe, it was internal factors which played the main role. The political and ideological system became ossified and the ruling structures became divorced from the people. The opportunity for thorough changes was missed. They should have been carried out at least during the "Prague Spring." Whereas we in the Soviet Union came to the conclusion, albeit not until the mid-eighties, that it was impossible to go on living that way, that recognition came to our neighbors late if at all. The initiative passed into the hands of other forces. Attempts by the ruling parties in 1988-1989 to rescue the situation by concessions to an increasingly strong opposition, the shuffling of political leaders, and partial changes did not produce results anywhere, of course.

It is debatable whether it was a democratic revolution (a peaceful revolution or one with an armed uprising and an army plot as in Romania), whether it was transfer of power as a result of an agreement between increasingly weak communist parties and increasingly powerful opposition movements, or whether it was a restoration of the old order. But one result—the renewal of society on a socialist basis—did not happen in any of those countries even though the objective preconditions for it existed. The political turnround was reinforced in the elections which took place in 1990. Now the left-wing parties, which still have not remedied the consequences of their defeat, can count at best on about 20-30 percent of the electorate's vote.

Social changes in those countries are now developing increasingly toward a rejection of the old values and a negation of everything connected with socialism. A course has been set which is aimed at replacing the system. Initially the changes affected the superstructure, while the socioeconomic structure began to undergo radical reforms in mid-1990. A number of countries have overtly embarked on introducing capitalism, others have begun transitional stages and mixed forms, but the direction of movement is the same.

There is one significant factor in all this. The present ruling forces took the helm in conditions of popular discontent with the policy of the communist and workers' parties which had governed their countries for four decades, that is, they came to power on a wave of criticism and rejection and under the banner of multiparty democracy, pluralism, the guarantee of the rights of the individual, and state independence. In the parliamentary elections no one called for capitalist ways, all the new parties and movements reviled the Communists and promised increased prosperity and the guarantee of freedom. But the miracle did not happen and thus many were disillusioned. That is why people are talking about the "stolen fruits" of the revolution. In actual fact there has been a universal increase in economic difficulties, a deterioration in living standards, inflation, and unemployment. Social tension is increasing and social explosions are being observed. And this is prompting the new

authorities to tighten the screws and introduce authoritarian forms of rule. What is the purpose of, for example, the CSFR draft law "On the threat to the state"? Despite the ousting of the left-wing parties, the social atmosphere is still characterized by fierce attacks on Communists and supporters of socialism and attempts to shift the responsibility on to them both for the obvious and the imaginary mistakes in the management of their countries in the recent past.

In Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary the main social confrontations are developing over the privatization of the state and public sector and the closure of unprofitable enterprises. The strengthening of the private sector, the enlistment of foreign capital, and the development of ties with the EEC are viewed by government structures as a way out of national crisis.

On the whole there is no doubt that the chain reaction of "velvet revolutions" in East Europe has resulted in the establishment of an area of painful political and social changes and harsh adaptation to the demands of the market economy. The situation in a number of countries is marked by instability. However, it would be naive to suppose that in these conditions the socialist parties' former positions can be restored.

But it is clear that the "return to Europe" proclaimed by the new governments promises to be long and arduous. It is not easy to gain entry to Western markets, the debt burden is pressing, structural reforms are needed, and the promised shower of credits has not fallen on this region yet. Meanwhile the transition in trade with the Soviet Union to payments in dollars has also created extra economic difficulties by depriving many enterprises of Soviet orders or consigning their work to the warehouse.

In these conditions one can see a trend toward the intensification of nationalist and chauvinist moods in the region and a noticeable rightward movement on the part of the ruling groupings. There is a polarization of forces in such movements as Solidarity and Civic Forum. In addition, the domestic need to pursue an austerity policy is often concealed by citing a threat from the USSR. Of course, the uncertainty of the situation in our country is bound to worry our neighbors. But do we really pose a "threat"?

People will remember that the initial impetus to the changes came from the Soviet Union. At the crucial stage, our country respected its neighbors' social choice. The Soviet leadership's reaction to the fundamental changes in those countries' lives was marked by consideration and calm. The Soviet troops stationed there did not intervene in the internal affairs this time. Furthermore, they are now leaving the region. It must be noted that this helped to increase confidence in the USSR's foreign policy in the spirit of the new political thinking.

However, to restrict oneself to such assertions would mean telling less than the whole truth. The reality is far more complex. The attitude to the Soviet Union in the region is far from uniform. The old system of relations has collapsed. It has not, however, been replaced yet by a new one and a vacuum has formed. Accusations are being leveled at us.

The logical conclusion is that in our foreign policy, this region, formerly a priority, has unjustifiably been relegated to the background. The volume of ties has been reduced to the bare minimum. This point was made at a meeting in the CPSU Central Committee. It is not just a matter of the collapse of state socialism in East Europe and the disappearance of the social uniformity of the former allies.

Overall our foreign policy in recent years has focused on the improvement of relations with the major capitalist countries and the solution of global problems. The importance of these tasks is not in doubt. The diminution of interest in neighboring countries was also due to the fact that many leaders of the former socialist countries gave Soviet perestroyka a hostile reception. Our advice on the need for change, set out in circumspect and tactful form through a description of the Soviet experience, was often rejected. The Soviet side had neither the wish nor the ability to interfere in the ruling parties' affairs. The use of force was precluded. The regimes did not have many reserves to fall back on. In the economic sphere we lacked the resources to extricate our friends from their economic difficulties, particularly their debts. Those debts totaled over $100 billion. Probably it was thought at first that perestroyka in the USSR would rapidly yield results, we would surge ahead, and we could then help our neighbors, too.

But it all worked out differently. Our internal crisis deepened. The Soviet presence in the region became increasingly weaker and events snowballed. As for the West, without intervening directly it found ways to encourage the new political forces and influenced the direction of change significantly with promises of economic aid. Moscow's neutral, temporizing position and the moral and political support from the United States and other Western countries had a varying effect. The GDR's inclusion in the FRG and corresponding affiliation to NATO is an indication of the weakening of the USSR's influence in the region.

Despite the successful conclusion of the difficult talks on the German settlement and the ratification of the treaties, our policy in East Europe is perceived—not without justification—as passive, and the Soviet Union's withdrawal from the former "community" without taking into account our vast material and intellectual investments there, as irrational. And although attempts have been made to find a common language, the Soviet Union's relations with its neighbors have become more complex. A predominantly skeptical, sometimes unfriendly attitude toward the USSR is to be seen in the circles which came to power in the East European countries. Whereas after 1985 Soviet perestroyka was viewed by those countries' opposition movements as a

factor helping them to reform their regimes from positions of pluralism and democracy, the ruling circles now do not balk at interference in the USSR's internal affairs and act in concert with those in our country who call into question the socialist perspective and the existence of the USSR as an integral state.

The turn of events in East Europe had a strong negative impact on the broadest strata of Soviet society. It encouraged attacks on the CPSU by destructive forces which are repeating scenarios worked out in East Europe. The collapse of the socialist community undoubtedly encouraged separatist trends within the USSR. The overall psychological effect of the downfall of our allies remains very grave. Against this background doubts appeared about the justification of certain foreign policy demarches by our country. The enforced and ill-prepared return home of a most mighty grouping of Soviet troops and the elimination of our military infrastructure in East Europe had an adverse reaction among military circles. The question of safeguarding our Western borders arises. One can also understand the indignation of veterans when they see the desecration of our monuments. CPSU members take an unambiguous view of the situation which has befallen our foreign comrades who are being persecuted.

It must be borne in mind that a scientifically correct assertion of the fact that the post-Stalinist model of socialism has collapsed in the East Europe countries is perceived at the level of ordinary consciousness and among the broad masses as the downfall of socialism in general and an historical impasse.

In other words, the changes in East Europe have overturned many conventional concepts and created a new situation. Our relations with the region's countries cannot be as they were. But our countries were and remain neighbors. For geopolitical, historical, political, economic, and ethnocultural reasons this region retains great significance for the Soviet Union. The interdependence of our countries is great. Our neighbors, despite the ideological antipathies of certain circles, are no less interested in the building of new ties with the USSR than we. This point was discussed during M.S. Gorbachev's meetings in Paris with the leaders of a number of East European countries. New contacts are in prospect in 1991.

Thus we are confronted by the need to elaborate a new concept of ties based on a pragmatic balance of interests. This requires different treaty frameworks for those ties because the old friendship and cooperation treaties have become obsolete. Work on the texts of new treaties with Hungary, Romania, and Czechoslovakia has already begun. It is too soon to say whether they will be treaties on friendship and cooperation, friendly relations, or the principles of relations.

How are our interests expressed? Specialists' discussions of these problems show that we, like the East European countries, are interested in good neighborliness and proper, mutually beneficial relations based on generally recognized norms of international law which take into account the experience of the development of the European process.

It is very important that neighboring states pursue a friendly policy toward us, that they are not sources of anti-Sovietism, that they do not act as an external catalyst of national separatism and centrifugal tendencies in the Soviet Union, that they do not pursue the policy of those forces which have not relinquished plans to reshape the political map of Europe. All these are real factors.

Our entire history leads to the conclusion that our neighbors should not constitute a real or potential threat to the Soviet Union's military security. Whatever the development of events in Europe, these countries must remain free of foreign bases and foreign armed forces.

Recently an accord was reached on eliminating the Warsaw Pact's military structures. The Warsaw Pact has fulfilled its historical role, which included putting forward a number of peace initiatives. We have the ability to safeguard our defense interests independently. But the Pact still exists along with certain mechanisms for foreign policy consultations among the member countries. Admittedly, some of our neighbors are now making ostentatious efforts to strengthen their ties with NATO. Some are even declaring their desire to join that military-political alliance. Clearly, such statements should be treated with caution. The point of the peace processes in Europe is not to bring NATO troops to the USSR's borders. Judging by the reaction in West European capitals, such comments are perceived there as onerous for NATO. Especially from the viewpoint of the consequences for talks on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces on the continent.

But there is a question here because the Americans would like to see NATO as the framework of a future security system in Europe. It seems that the question of a nonbloc European security system is being put on the back burner. The end of the Persian Gulf conflict will clarify a lot. But at the moment "triangles"—Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary—are forming. Without institutions or the formation of alliances at the moment but with hints on the need to hinder the "restoration of the old ways." Time will show the durability and purpose of these and other subregional associations. One would not like this to be linked with some kind of "cordons sanitaires," "petites ententes," and so forth.

Taking into account the profound need of all the European states for the success of the all-European process, our country has a special interest in a peaceful development of East Europe in which international, territorial, and other frictions and disputes do not develop into conflicts. The transformation of East Europe into a region of stability, collaboration, and cooperation is the

essential condition for progress toward a single European space and the USSR's participation in it. Herein lies our general state interest, one may say.

There is much that is attractive in the Soviet-Finnish model of bilateral relations. Economic ties are of particularly great significance. Our neighbors have a vital interest in Soviet supplies of energy sources, certain types of raw materials, and machinery. It must not be forgotten that East Europe is a natural market for our industrial output and for investment, entrepreneurial, and other economic activity. At the moment only the initial steps are being taken toward cooperation on market bases. Neither we nor our neighbors have hard currency and therefore we could use the foreign currency clearing system and barter for some time. It is hardly appropriate to rely solely on the objective coincidence of interests in the economic sphere. There must be a reciprocal search for forms of cooperation and evidence of reliable partnership commitments. The creation of a new multilateral economic cooperation organization to replace CEMA, which was based on a centralized plan and directive mechanism of ties, will obviously help to recreate the fabric of cooperation. I think that after the inevitable fall in the volumes of reciprocal trade, it will enter a stage of dynamic development on a new and regulated basis.

There are opportunities to preserve our cultural presence in East Europe, particularly in the Slavic countries. The cause would be helped by reviving ties between sister cities and oblasts and the fuller use of the potential of "popular diplomacy."

Two questions arise. How do our neighbors regard the restructuring of relations with the USSR on a new, nonideologized basis? It may be said with confidence that constructively minded political circles are showing great interest in this. Their influence is predominant. M.S. Gorbachev's proposal on convening a conference of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest was received positively by everyone. Our diplomats assert that the decline in cooperation has already bottomed out. But what is the West's viewpoint? One can hardly suppose that the state of instability and chaos in the region meets the interests of our Western partners.

Thus while recognizing the reality of the changes in East Europe and on the continent as a whole, it is legitimate to pose the question of the need for the practical building of good-neighborly and mutually beneficial relations between our country and its neighbors. It is now a matter of political contacts and government and parliamentary ties.

Stepping up the CPSU's cooperation with left-wing parties and also with the new political formations in the region will also benefit contact between peoples. Experience shows that pauses and interruptions in cooperation are contrary to our long-term interests, are incompatible with historical traditions, and are not conducive to the solution of joint tasks in promoting the European peace process.

TASS Reportage on Churkin 13 March Briefing

CEMA, Mediterranian Issues

LD1303175691 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanischev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaly Churkin told a briefing here today that the permanent envoys of the member-countries to the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) will meet in Moscow on March 14 and 15 to discuss problems which arose following the adjournment of the 46th meeting of the CMEA session and of the meeting of the heads of governments of these countries.

He recalled that the meetings were initially scheduled for February 27 and 28 in Budapest. It was expected to adopt the decision scrapping the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and establishing a new intergovernmental organisation of international economic assistance.

"It is our idea," the spokesman said, "the meeting that opens in Moscow on Thursday should work out an answer to the following questions of principle: Do CMEA member-countries really need a new organisation of economic cooperation, and if they do, what kind of organisation it should be".

Speaking about the Soviet Union's approach to these questions, Churkin said that "we see no reason whatsoever for rejecting the idea of an open, depoliticized and deideologized organisation, which by no means infringes on its members' sovereign right to join any other economic organisations and structures, including of integrational character, and which would help them switch their own cooperation over to a market basis and principles generally accepted in practice worldwide."

Before replying to questions from correspondents, Churkin said that during his Soviet visit, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will examine, together with Soviet officials, the situation in the Persian Gulf and the entire range of Mideast problems, including the Arab-Israeli conflict.

"We maintain contacts with Arab countries and the United States to work out our own approaches which will be publicized at an appropriate moment," Churkin said and added he hoped the appropriate moment might occur this week.

In addition to Mideast problems, the Soviet side plans to touch upon disarmament problems, above all the reduction of strategic offensive weapons, outstanding questions remaining after the signing in Paris of the treaty on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe and other problems.

Asked about projected political contacts between the Soviet Union and Greece, Churkin said talks on a visit to Athens of the Soviet foreign minister have been underway for the past few months. For a number of technical reasons, the visit could not take place during the first ten days of 1991, but it is now time to say it will probably take place in the first ten days of April. The exact date for the visit is being discussed.

Asked why the Cyprus issue was not raised during Turkish President Turgut Ozal's visit to the Soviet Union, Churkin replied that the visit was mainly directed to imparting a new impulse to bilateral Soviet-Turkish relations. Besides, he said, three months ago, this problem was discussed in great detail during the Soviet foreign minister's visit to Turkey. Churkin recalled that the Soviet Union had voted in favour of all resolutions on Cyprus adopted by the United Nations, supported the mission of the U.N. secretary-general, used and would continue to use all suitable diplomatic channels and occasions to discuss the problem.

Mideast Security Diplomacy Continues

LD1303143291 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin today confirmed at a briefing that the Soviet leadership and president Mikhail Gorbachev recently sent messages to the heads of many Arab states, outlining our vision of security structures in the Gulf and the Middle East, as well as some ideas on these issues.

"We are also engaged in active dialogue on these issues with the leadership of other countries," Churkin noted.

The spokesman confirmed that the Soviet side also continues contacts with Iraq, including through diplomatic channels.

Churkin stressed that, after restoring Kuwait's independence through international efforts, the international community is facing the task of radically improving the situation in the Gulf and the Middle East.

In his words, many states began work to ensure peace and stability for peoples in that region and to free the entire system of international relations from chronic crises emerging in the Gulf and the Middle East as a whole.

Comments on Salvadoran Elections

LD1303152191 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman expressed hope that parliamentary and municipal elections held in El Salvador last Sunday will speed up the process of national reconciliation and help promote efforts aimed at a political settlement of the crisis there.

Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today that Moscow also shares the confidence of the Salvadoran Government and left-centre forces that the voting can give a fresh impetus to the quest for the solution of the conflict through talks.

Regarding the atmosphere of the elections held in El Salvador, the spokesman noted that some 200 international observers present at the elections, having no doubts about the results of the voting, noted at the same time that there were a number of violations. Thus a considerable number of voters, up to 400,000, according to some estimates, had been registered but had not been issued ballots. As a result of serious deviations from the established procedure, elections were put off in a number of constituencies, the spokesman said.

He also noted that the March 10 elections were held during the offensive of the government troops, while rebels, as a goodwill gesture, announced unilateral ceasefire for the election period.

SRV Statement on Cambodia Supported

LD1303152691 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Proposals, expressed in a statement by Vietnamese Foreign Ministry on February 28, 1991, which are aimed at localising the civil war and stimulating the inter-Khmer dialogue, are consonant with the USSR's position, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told today's briefing in Moscow.

Describing the essence of the Vietnamese statement, the spokesman said that it underlines the need for the earliest ceasefire in Cambodia and the resumption of activities by the Cambodian Supreme National Council.

Vietnam called on all states to promote these efforts to resume the activities by the Paris conference on Cambodia and suggested that all the parties involved in the conflict should agree on imposing a moratorium on all types of military aid to the Cambodian sides.

On its part, Vietnam is ready, together with Thailand and Laos, to take obligations to prevent the transportation of weapons to Cambodia through their territories from other states.

"It is important that peace initiatives should be in tune with the known plan put forth by the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council," Churkin stressed.

"Only a mutually acceptable solution on Cambodia will bring peace to the people in that country and will be an element in the system of Asian security."

CSCE Forum Discusses Communications Network

LD1303180591 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna March 13 TASS—Routine work continues at the talks on confidence-building measures and security in Europe in Vienna.

Today's plenary meeting of the 34-nation forum discussed the establishment of the communications network of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), which will supplement diplomatic channels between states.

All participants in this constructive discussion expressed unanimous opinion that the very decision to set up a network of direct communications between the CSCE capitals to transmit reports concerning the above measures, became an impressive achievement of the Vienna negotiating process.

The Netherlands is coordinating this project, and it has done much for its practical implementation. Technical characteristics and other parameters of the network were specified, and contracting firms to build it were chosen.

At the same time speakers at the meeting said that the project's preparations are somewhat lagging behind the schedule. This is explained by the difficult nature and originality of the project.

Some experts believe that the project's technical documentation submitted by the Hewlett Packard firm, which was recommended as the key contractor, does not fully meet the demands to the network's technical characteristics agreed by participating states.

In addition, the CSCE states have not finally settled the ticklish question of distributing costs for the establishment and operation of the communications network.

International Construction Conference Previewed

PM1403141591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report by M. Glebov: "Businessmen Choose Suzdal"]

[Text] During five days in April an event which the organizers call an international business meeting will be held in the pearl of the non-Chernozem—Suzdal.

The organizers are the "Nechernozemagropromstroy" association, with an annual volume of construction and installation work worth a sum approaching 3.5 billion rubles [R], the association for foreign economic relations from Leningrad, and the German firm "Janus," which has experience with successful work in rendering aid to Armenia. The subject matter of the forthcoming talk cannot perhaps be fit into a single phrase. If only because there will be many conversations (and entirely specific conversations) and topics for committed discussion during these five days of the business meeting.

For instance, specialists from the association together with their counterparts from the All-Union Institute of Light Alloys developed a new design for a granary made of aluminum, and assembled 50 of these structures last year. Plans are ready for small-scale stockraising units to be used by one or two families, and sanitary extension modules which make it possible to improve the standard of comfort in existing villages.

Understandably, all this will be on the agenda of the Suzdal meeting. As will questions of the use of the capacities of Soviet enterprises freed as a result of conversion and the organization of activity under market conditions, the construction of asphalt plants and gas boilers...

It must be supposed that the organizations which will send their representatives to Suzdal for the 8 through 12 April period are not troubled by the price of the "ticket" for the right to take part in this business meeting: R5,000 or $2,000-3,000.

United States & Canada

Baker Visit Previewed, Mideast Focus Noted

To Meet Gorbachev 15 Mar

LD1403053191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0400 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] James Baker, U.S. secretary of State, arrives in Moscow today on a visit. Vitaliy Ignatenko, assistant to the USSR president, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign correspondents that a meeting between him and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has been planned for 15 March. The president's assistant expressed the conviction that the meeting will be useful. It will help to work out reliable plans for a post-war settlement in the Middle East.

Both Seek Mideast Resolution

LD1403043391 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Excerpts] After completing his tour of some Middle East countries, the American Secretary of State James Baker is arriving in Moscow on 14 March. Vladislav Kozyakov has contributed this comment:

For the American visitor, the talks with Soviet officials will be a kind of continuation of his consultations in Egypt, Israel, and Saudi Arabia. Their theme was the promotion of security in the region following the end of the Gulf war.

What can we expect from the coming Soviet-American talks? The result can obviously be impressive provided the two sides will act in the spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation—the spirit displayed during the formation of an anti-Iraqi coalition at the United Nations Organization.

We would like to hope that the advice of the kind given by Senator Robert Dole or some American observers recently will leave no impact on American policies. Their advice was America should oppose the Soviet Union's interference in the affairs of the Middle East. Such advice, if heeded, can hardly help ensure international security in the region.

The opinion has been voiced in many European Community countries and in the Arab world that the coalition of states formed to check the aggression in the Gulf can well serve the purpose of resolving other most complicated conflicts such as the Arab-Israel conflict or the Lebanese conflict. It can also contribute to the work of building a system of security in the region. That was stated during the Soviet-Turkish talks held in Moscow this week. [passage omitted]

President Bush, too, has spoken lately on many occasions about the importance of the active policy pursued by the United Nations Organization where the Soviet Union and the United States act not on the basis of confrontation, as before, but on the basis of cooperation. In short, the outcome of the talks in Moscow will largely depend on what the secretary of state will bring along in his diplomatic portfolio.

During the forthcoming talks in Moscow the two sides will probably discuss in detail problems relating to the completion of the work on a START treaty. The negotiations over it have reached an impasse. Lack of progress at the START negotiations were one of the reasons why the Soviet-American summit scheduled for February was postponed. The other reason was the Gulf war. Now this reason no longer exists. The time has obviously come for removing the second obstacle as well.

Washington officials think that it is quite possible for George Bush to come to Moscow at the end of June. Though there are still more than three months ahead, there is no reason why we should be slow with the preparations for (?such) an important event. Baker's forthcoming talks in Moscow offer a good chance for consolidating the success of joint actions and for moving towards [words indistinct]

Both Seek 'New World Order'

LD1403132491 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] PRAVDA's imaginary comparison at one time of superpower relations was to that of a suspension bridge which can withstand any storm if solidly built. This seems to be a very good analogy today. In the past few months relations have been put to a series of tests, including the Gulf crisis, hitches in disarmament talks, the resignation of Mr. Shevardnadzne who did much to promote bilateral relations, events in the Baltic republics which caused America irritation and the flare up of anti-Soviet and anti-American attitudes.

Some began to talk—though somewhat prematurely—about a cooling, a pause, and even a setback in Soviet-American relations. True, the two countries pursue different interests, and they are—and are likely to be—at odds on certain international issues. But the main thing which brings them together remains; that is, both are aware of their responsibility for international peace and both seek partnership in creating a new world order.

Neither Moscow nor Washington are out to rock the boat deliberately by trying to strain, let alone wreck their relationship. One glaring proof is the Gulf crisis. Moscow was set at resolving it peacefully, but Washington opted for a military solution by dismissing Soviet diplomatic efforts which could have led to the liberation of Kuwait without hostilities. Nonetheless, the unity of the anti-Iraq coalition remains intact as did the Soviet Union's commitment to Security Council resolutions condemning the Iraqi aggression.

A new period, no less difficult, now exists for a postwar reconstruction in the region. President Bush has come up with his own regional peace plan which Mr. Baker discussed in the Middle East countries. For his part, President Gorbachev sent a message to the Arab leaders outlining his visions of the postwar security structures in the Gulf and the Middle East, but the details of the Soviet plan are still unknown.

Notably, while in the Middle East Mr. Baker talked on the telephone with the Soviet foreign minister, Mr. Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, to consult him. It is to be hoped that the two sides will now coordinate their approaches to a postwar settlement during talks in Moscow.

On disarmanent the two countries were due to finalize the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty last month, but failed to do so. The delay is causing worries, and Moscow hopes that this could be finalized in the near future to enable a superpower summit to be held in the first half of this year.

Gulf Issues Highlight Differences

LD1403105191 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Pavel Vasilyev commentary]

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—Now that the results of the Gulf conflict are being summed up, one of the key issues comes to the fore: How will Gulf events influence Soviet-American relations?

The reply to this question will depend not only on what has happened but also on how realistically the two powers will behave themselves.

They have shown the maturity of ideas and actions for the time being. The two powers have passed several critical points when one or two wrong steps could have entailed a dangerous relapse of mistrust and confrontation, which could have been followed by an escalation of political miscalculations.

Despite the common line to oppose the Iraqi aggression, the USSR and the United States formed, over the six months of the crisis, their own approaches on the basis of their own interests, which did not fully concur.

Soviet-American cooperation helped find common ground for correct actions, however. The Soviet-American joint statements in Helsinki and Washington show the broad sphere of concurring interests and approaches of the two countries.

Nevertheless, the start of the land offensive by multinational forces, when Moscow was convinced of a chance to avoid this phase of the conflict, put Soviet-American cooperation to a serious test.

Later, the two sides made efforts not to aggravate this test. The ceasefire and the resumption by the U.N. Security Council of the problem's discussion helped overcome tactical differences between Washington and Moscow.

But, have the two countries overcome all political and psychological differences?

Judging by direct or indirect attempts to put into doubt the policy for cooperation between the USSR and the United States, it is difficult to give a completely positive reply to this question.

Considerable political and diplomatic efforts will be needed to strengthen the present level of Soviet-American relations.

There are some differences not only on Middle East issues. Arms limitation issues should be also settled at the negotiating table, otherwise these issues may lead to unfavourable political consequences.

The United States should clarify its intentions against the background of the difficult political evolution in the USSR.

These three questions will evidently be the main items on the agenda of U.S. Secretary of State Baker's talks in Moscow next week.

The talks will probably be difficult, but it looks like that there are chances for progress and better understanding between the two countries on each of these points.

Churkin Interviewed

LD1303162991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1330 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Interview with Vitaliy Churkin, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Department, by correspondent Viktor Levin on visit by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker; place and date not given—recorded]

[text] [Levin] Vitaliy Ivanovich, will the question of U.S. President George Bush travelling to Moscow be raised during these talks? This visit was planned for February, but was postponed because the United States was very heavily involved in the events in the Persian Gulf. Now that these events, one could say, are now over, the question of the visit comes up in all acuteness.

[Churkin] For this reason it is up to the President to decide on the question. As you remember, the statement on the fresh Soviet-U.S. summit made in January said that a certain amount of time was needed to prepare the strategic offensive weapons treaty. But, as you have correctly noted, the fact that the war was going on in the Persian Gulf was indicated as the main reason why the meeting did not take place in February. It would have been difficult for the U.S. President, as the president of a country at war, to leave his capital at that time. If the secretary of state does bring along some ideas from his President about a new date for the summit, then obviously this issue will be discussed and examined. I would

remind you that the January announcement about the summit said that it would take place in the first half of 1991, so there is still time to fit in with the dates set out in the joint statement.

[Levin] Vitaliy Ivanovich, I would like to return to the problem of the Near East settlement, and in connection with this, to ask you: What is the Soviet Union's attitude to the proposal of French President Mitterand for the convening of a Security Council session at the level of heads of governments?

[Churkin] In principle, such an idea does not contradict our approach, or the fact that we attach the greatest importance to the problems of the Near East, and consider that the most urgent and energetic efforts need to be undertaken in order to move ourselves in the nearest future in the direction of resolving this long overdue problem. As for our specific reaction to this statement by the president of France, then of course such things should fit in with the overall context of the program that we are currently working on concerning both the Persian Gulf and a Near East settlement.

[Lenin] Another question about Soviet-U.S. relations: A number of articles in certain of our newspapers during the war in the Persian Gulf included a tone which, in my view, could give the Americans grounds to doubt our fidelity to the pledges which we adopted. Our official policy is very clear and principled. The foundations of the approach to settling the crisis over the seizure of Kuwait by Iraq, set down by former Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, have been developed further. But the attacks on Shevardnadze's policies, the attacks on him personally, and the attacks on our approach to this settlement, with a certain expression, as I see it, of emphatic sympathy with Iraq and its leader—for all my sympathy with Iraq, I do not share the sympathy with its leader—how has this affected, or is it affecting, our relations with the United States?

[Churkin] Viktor Nikolayevich, you have recalled some dramatic episodes connected with the crisis in the Persian Gulf and with Iraq's aggression, including episodes connected with the internal political struggle which, you have correctly noted, flared up in our country over all this set of problems. But I would not like to return again to this theme, for the simple reason that events have confirmed that Soviet foreign policy—whatever its critics may have said in the past—has proved to be correct. It was correct partly because we have managed to preserve unity of action, if you like, with the United States, which is the guarantee of effective solution of a whole number of international problems, and of stability in international relations.

There was the time when, for example, we were putting forward some initiatives of our own, and they were taken in a very positive way by the United States and by the leaders of the majority of other countires. Gorbachev's plan, you will recall, was described by President Bush as an important and serious attempt to bring Iraq to implementation of the UN Security Council resolutions. In sum, whatever fleeting shadows may have seemed to outside observers to have crept into Soviet-U.S. relations, we have emerged with the potential for cooperation preserved, and this will be extremely important both for resolution of the Near East Problem and for the examination of numerous problems which remain in international life. In this connection I would just like to underline our confidence that the forthcoming talks with State Secretary Baker in Moscow will be full, fruitful, and useful not just for our two countries, but for the whole world.

Baker's Mideast Tour Shows Peace Prospects

LD1303151391 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] After talks with officials of the Arab states within the anti-Iraqi coalition, U S. Secretary of State James Baker has visited Jerusalem, where he has had meetings with the Israeli leaders and the Palestinians. Possibilities were discussed on starting an Arab-Israeli dialogue in order to end the conflict that has been going on for more than 43 years and has been the main source of instability in the region. Here is an estimate of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's efforts from our commentator Yuriy Solton.

Mr. Baker has proved to be a skillful diplomat. It is reported from Jerusalam that both Israelis and Palestinians have been satisfied with his visit. Does that mean there is real hope for a fair solution of the Palestinian problem and for normalizing Arab-Israeli relations, then? No, it does not to my mind. There have been some shifts indeed. The American secretary of state and the Israeli prime minister arrived at agreement about the two parallel lines in the approaches to the Middle East settlement. Provisions are made for simultaneous talks with Arab countries and with Palestinians. It is also important that Mr. Baker intends to resume Washington's direct contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization, contacts broken off over a year ago. The solution of the region's problems is impossible without the PLO, regardless of the different attitudes to it.

This is quite so. But there remains the tough stand of Israel, which led to the Palestinian uprising on the occupied lands, going on now for more than three years. In Jerusalem, Israel actually rejected the American plan—land for peace—and confirmed a total lack of desire to enter into any contacts with the PLO, which it regards as a terrorist organization. Only a vague promise was made to grant limited autonomy to the Palestinians, yet with some strings attached. For one, in response to the American state secretary's call to relax repressions against the Palestinians, Israeli Foreign Minister David Levi said that his country would not budge and it would not be forced to its knees by terrorism. Israel, he said, would keep sticking to a firm stand, stretching out a

hand to the Palestinians at the same time. The foreign minister of Israel underlined that as for the Palestinian self-government, it was possible to talk about it only if the Arab population behaved properly.

Israel still keeps the keys to an easing of the situation in the Middle East. The persuasion by the United States, which after the victory over Iraq would have liked to have had close relations with the Arabs, does not yield tangible results.

So what is the way out? As I see it, the world community must show as much determination with regard to the Middle East settlement as it did about the Iraqi aggression. Although many years have passed, the capture of foreign lands does not become legal. Israel must pull out from Arab territories it occupied in 1967. But Arabs, too, who in 1947 and 1948 rejected the UN General Assembly decision about the division of Palestine and launched war against Israel, must recognize the right of the State of Israel to secure existence. This formula has been known for a long time, but in view of the changing situation in the region and in the rest of the world, there have appeared favorable possibilities—it seems to me—for concrete action on the formula. It will be shortsighted to miss the possibilities, comments Yuriy Solton.

Controversy Continues Over Embassy in Moscow

PM1203161191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Nadein: "Top Hat for the Embassy. One of the Last 'Cold War' Scandals Ends"]

[Text] Washington—The new U.S. Embassy building in Moscow, which has been empty for roughly five years now, will probably be deemed fit for use after it is fitted with an additional three-story structure reminiscent of a "top hat" in shape. I. Selin, U.S. under secretary of state, suggested this plan by way of an "innovative decision" to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee [as published].

The scandal involving the discovery of listening devices in the wall blocks and concrete floors of the embassy complex near Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment by Soviet contract organizations blew up more than five years ago.

At first the Soviet authorities denied these charges. Shortly after, however, a series of news conferences were held in Washington discussing similar listening devices which the U.S. special services had installed in the new USSR Embassy building on Washington's Wisconsin Avenue.

The U.S. Government refused to accept the new building, saying it was impossible to use it for reasons of secrecy. Construction work to complete the new embassy was stopped altogether in August 1985. U.S. specialists concluded that only the complete destruction of the entire eight-story block and the erection of a new building in its place could provide a surefire guarantee.

Unlike the Americans, our specialists in Washington were prepared to discover and remove all the listening devices. In accordance with the indisputable principle of reciprocity, however, the U.S. authorities did not permit this. This is now the sixth year that Soviet diplomats have been forced to bypass the empty, fully finished building

The new plan announced by the under secretary of state envisages the demolition of the last story and the addition of three new stories in its stead. They must be fitted by U.S. construction workers, under the direction of U.S. managers, and using special structures manufactured in the United States.

If legislators accept this proposal, which has U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's support, the cost of the work would drop from the proposed $300 million to $200 million. THE WASHINGTON POST announced that U.S. intelligence services have still not given the plan their "go-ahead," however.

The timeframe is another important consideration in the new proposal's favor. The State Department claims that putting up a new building may take an unforeseeably long time in view of the current state of transport systems and the economy as a whole in the Soviet Union. It should not take more than two years to put up three stories.

A. Selin's report provoked conflicting impressions among legislators. Some senators said that a saving of $100 million is not worth it if there still is even a small probability of secrecy not being absolutely guaranteed.

For his part, the under secretary of state indicated the existing "near 90-percent" agreement with the Soviet authorities.

China

Maslyukov Heads Economic Delegation to Beijing

LD1103212391 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 11 Mar 91

[Report by V. Kulikov from Beijing, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A Soviet delegation, headed by deputy USSR Prime Minister Yuriy Maslyukov, is holding talks in Beijing with a group of Chinese leaders, headed by Tian Jiyun, vice premier of the State Council. This is an extraordinary session of the Soviet-Chinese mixed commission on economic cooperation, formed several years ago, the cochairmen of which are the deputy prime ministers of our countries. In recent years China has been turning into an important economic partner of the Soviet Union, an equal partner in all respects. The

Chinese market today means an abundance of consumer goods and household electronic goods: it means high quality of export products. Behind this is the rapid development of the industry, science and technology of the country. Noting the 10 biggest achievements of the Chinese economy in 1990, China announced a few days ago that the country has taken first place in the world for production of ready-made clothes, cotton fabrics, and television sets. Thus, in the situation taking shape in our country in the market for consumer goods, the prospects for expansion of Soviet-Chinese trade and economic ties are of very great importance.

The Chinese side also has an interest in cooperation. This refers to Soviet manufactured goods, raw materials resources, and our country's scientific and technological potential. One should probably add that our cooperation in the sphere of economy is developing in the context of the normalization of political relations between the two state. The visit to our country by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party, due in May, is an important step in this normalization. The coordination of the efforts of the two countries to expand all-round cooperation, and to put it into a more decent condition than at present, as the head of the Soviet delegation put it, is just what the talks are about.

[Begin Maslyukov recording] I would like to point out the constructive approach of our Chinese colleagues to the problems under discussion. Today, groups of experts in all areas start work. I think that today, tomorrow, and the next day will see the details of our accords worked out in detail. Then another working meeting will be held. I will inform you later about the results. [end recording]

Rogachev Holds Talks in Beijing 11-13 Mar

OW1403101491 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev, a member of a Soviet delegation visiting Beijing, held a series of meetings with Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Xu Dunxin and U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Solomon on the Cambodian issue between 11 and 13 March. Solomon was in Beijing to hold consultations with Chinese Foreign Ministry officials.

Rogachev also met with the Vietamese and French ambassadors to China, and arranged and discussed with them concrete steps to promote talks [on the Cambodian issue]. He reiterated that all parties in Cambodia and all countries concerned must continue to make efforts to solve the issue politically as soon as possible.

China's Policy Change on Cambodia Dims Peace Hopes

OW1103192591 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1000 GMT 10 Mar 91

[(Zolov) commentary]

[Text] Listeners, Cambodian Premier Hun Sen stated two days ago that the Cambodian Government would agree to an immediate cease-fire with the provision that foreign countries stop supporting the opposition. Vietnam also stated earlier that if foreign countries stop supporting Cambodian opposition, Vietnam would also stop its military assistance to Cambodia. Here is a commentary by station observer (Zolov):

All those who mediate the Cambodian conflict understand the importance of their mission. It is no wonder that a cease-fire is listed as the first objective in the plan drawn up by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. Apparently, even though there is still hope for Cambodia's post-war reconstruction when [words indistinct] blood continues to shed, [word indistinct] very precarious. (?Furthermore), if the military support from various quarters does not stop, a cease-fire cannot be attained.

This is also the view shared by the representatives of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council—the Soviet Union, China, the United States, Britain, and France—when they drew up their plan to restore peace in Cambodia. To this end, they also issued relevant statements. China stated last November that it would stop all military support to Cambodian opposition. It seems, however, that China has recently changed its stand. Duan Jun, spokesman for China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated in Beijing on 7 March that China would not stop its military support for the Cambodia's resistance force before a comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian conflict is achieved. This is to say that, while China supports all Cambodian factions to negotiate a mutual cease-fire, China would not stop its arms supply to the Khmer Rouge. If this is true, then the mission to restore peace in Cambodia will become more complex.

It is clear that the problems in Cambodia cannot be settled once and for all. Peace in Cambodia can only be attained stage by stage, and problems confronting Cambodia can only be settled step by step. The UN proposals for settling the Cambodian issue are based on this concept. Their main points are: All conflicting parties in Cambodia should cease fire immediately; foreign countries should also immediately stop their military assistance to the conflicting parties; after this, Britain should begin to disengage the armies of various hostile parties; and, prior to carrying out free elections and organizing a national united government, peace shall be maintained so that a comprehensive political settlement of the conflict can be achieved.

So far, all parties support this stand. They have (?even) discussed that, prior to the cease-fire, members of the UN Security Council should stop their military assistance to all parties in Cambodia so that the plan for restoring peace in Cambodia can be achieved. Now, this common, clear-cut peace plan will not be achieved because a big country has changed its stand. Meanwhile, encouraged by having continual support, the Khmer

Rouge has intensified its offensive against the bastions of the Phnom Penh army, and casulties are increasing. The hopes for restoring peace in Cambodia have again become unattainable in the foreseeable future.

Northeast Asia

Team Spirit Exacerbates DPRK, ROK Tension

SK1403095091 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Commentary on U.S.-ROK Team Spirit exercise by station military commentator (Chevo Tarebo)—recorded]

[Text] The main stage of the Team Spirit ROK-U.S. joint military exercise to achieve the perfection of combat operations on the ground and sea is in progress, it began 7 March. Station military commentator (Chevo Tarebo) writes: Not long ago I toured the Far East. At that time I had a chance to meet and talk with Rear Admiral (Chaichev), deputy chief of staff of the Soviet Pacific Fleet.

In the conversation, Rear Admiral (Chaichev) said: Some 100 joint military exercises with different countries have been staged every year in the Far East and Southeast Asia. Among these military exercises, some military exercises are large scale ones which make the situation in this region very complicated. First of all, the Team Spirit exercise belongs to this kind of the military exercise. We have keenly watched this military exercise because the task of deploying new combined units to (?test) various offensive operation plans is to be carried out in the course of the exercise. Moreover, the exercise foresees the utilization of various types of weapons, including nuclear weapons, in the exercise. In a nutshell, such an act tells us that the general situation of Asia and the Pacific is not a (?normal) situation and that it runs counter to the sound [word indistinct].

Station commentator (Chevo Tarebo) said that some people say the Team Spirit military exercise this time is being conducted on a reduced scale. In fact, approximately 140,000 troops, instead of 200,000, are participating in this military exercise. No additional military troops were mobilized from the United States. The period of the main stage of this military exercise is from this week to 10 April. The concentration of military troops and the character of the work that they seek to achieve leads us to use keen vigilance from the military standpoint, however.

As is known, all armed forces of the DPRK are in an enhanced combat posture to cope with this exercise. The North-South premiers talks have been suspended. We can verify how acute and strong the DPRK's reaction to the military exercise is. It is clear that the situation on the [Korean] peninsula has intensified, however. The situation on the peninsula has become complicated.

As indicated by a spokesman of the U.S. Department of State recently, the ROK [hanguk] still remains a region where the possibility of military conflict is the hightest. In conclusion, the station's military commentator says that, such being the case, we should make all possible efforts to alleviation the military tension.

Commentary Assesses DPRK-Japan Talks on Ties

SK1403101591 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Commentary by station commentator (Mikhail Lvov) on DPRK-Japan talks in Tokyo]

[Text] In talks held in Tokyo to normalize relations between the DPRK and Japan, the two sides reconfirmed their willingness to continue the talks in the future. The third round of talks is slated for May in Beijing.

Station commentator (Mikhail Lvov) writes: The DPRK-Japan talks held in Tokyo for two days focused on two acute issues: paying compensation to the DPRK for the damage that Japan inflicted to the Korean people in the past and allowing the international inspection of North Korea's nuclear facilities. This time again, the two sides failed to narrow their differences on these issues.

The discussions on other issues, however, were more effective. It is expected that agreement on some of them will be reached soon. For instance, the Korean side responded with understanding to Tokyo's request for realizing contacts between Japanese residing in the DPRK and their relatives residing in Japan. The Pyongyang delegation evaluated Tokyo's plan to cancel an unfair trial against Koreans in Japan as evidence of progress. Therefore, the two sides' hopes for successful progress in the dialogue have gained ground.

On the other hand, time and the great efforts of both sides are necessary to eliminate all obstacles to the road of the normalization of diplomatic relations between the two countries. This is not surprising because the relations between Tokyo and Pyongyang have been influenced by the cold war for a long time. The history of Korea-Japan relations has left [words indistinct] The Korean people cannot forget the period of the Japanese colonial rule. But, anyway, the past is the past.

Tokyo and Pyongyang both believe that the establishment of official relations between them [passage indistinct] the situation on the Korean peninsula and the region around it. The course of destroying the confrontational structure which has been created in this region already has begun.

The principle of mutual relations between states is changing. Therefore, Pyongyang and Tokyo view optimistically the future relations between the two countries.

Near East & South Asia

Military Expert Views Iraqi Gulf War Losses

LD1303223291 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1400 GMT 12 Mar 91

[Text] [Unidentified correspondent] Here, ladies and gentlemen, is our weekly programme "A Scholar's Views on Questions of the East," which deals today with the military results of the Kuwait crisis.

The combat operations in the Arab Gulf have ended. What were the military results of these operations? Extremely conflicting reports have been coming from the command of the multinational forces and Iraqi soruces. What is the price paid by the anti-Iraq coalition for its military victory? what is the state of the Iraqi military capability after all that has happened?

Our political and military adviser, Dr. Sergey Aleksandrov, replies to these and other questions that might come up in the course of our discussion.

Dr. Aleksandrov, the Western information media affirm that the Iraqi war machine has destroyed. What is your opinion?

[Aleksandrov] Of course, the Iraqi Armed Forces have suffered enormous losses in life. But with regard to the military operations, only the armies out of the armed forces took part, about 545,000 officers and men, whereas the total number of members of the Iraqi armed forces is about 1 million. About half of the Iraqi Army was not exposed to strikes by the coalition forces.

For example, there were between 10 to 14 Iraqi divisions on the Iraqi-Turkish borders, and some six divisions on the Iraqi-Syrian borders, with about five other Iraqi divisions in the western southern regions. These divisions did not take part in the operations. Some of the Iraqi divisions stayed behind at the Iraqi-Iranian borders after the withdrawal of the 15 Iraqi divisions from there.

According to western estimates, there is one division and several brigades of the Republican Guard in Baghdad's suburbs. They have excelelnt shelters. Perhaps that is probably why they suffered relatively few losses.

There are also several commando brigades in the Iraqi Kurdish areas. Their task is to combat the Kurdish movement's detachments.

Furthermore, there are members of the Popular Army who number 850,000 strong. This army is huge, but it lacks proper training and has no combat experience.

As to the Iraqi losses in military hardware, they too were colossal. But military experts estimate that there are 1,300 tanks, 3,200 armored vehicles, and 2,000 field guns under the disposal of the ruling regime in Baghdad. The Iraqi leadership has further succeeded in preserving a number of mobile missile launchers and about 60 percent of its fighter planes. Generally speaking, the Iraqi war machine is still alive.

[Correspondent] What, in your estimation, was the loss suffered by the Baghdad military industrial establishments?

[Aleksandrov] I believe that the Iraqi military industry has been totally destroyed, and so were the atomic reactors. It is very sad indeed that along with the destruction of the factories and plants which actually worked to meet needs of the Iraqi Armed Forces, the coalition attacked peaceful economic targets. The Soviet newspapers have, for example, published pictures showing the destruction of the baby milk food factory by the coalition air strikes.

I believe that the Iraqi Republic has lost not only its war industry, but also a large section of its economic capacity in general. A very long time, huge sums of money, and enormous efforts will be needed to remove the destruction and ruination and to normalize the economic life of the country . I believe that the economic losses which the country suffered in a matter of a few weeks exceeded by far the losses suffered by the Iraqi economy as a result of the Iranian-Iraqi war, which lasted eight years.

Finally, as is known, Iraq is a developing country. Its economic development requires manpower, which lacks. It is said that the number of innocent people killed as a result of the 112,000 sorties on Iraq was at least 150,000 people. In addition to its human tragic consequences, this matter creates a serious economic problem for Iraq.

[Correspondent] Great hopes were pinned on the Iraqi Republican Guard. What are these forces? Why were they formed? Have they realized the hopes pinned on their combat capabilities in the battle against the coalition forces?

[Aleksandrov] Prior to the Gulf War, the Republican Guard units constituted about one fifth of the total number of Iraqi armed forces. Prior to the escalation of the Iran-Iraq war, the task of these units was mainly to protect the president of the republic and his places of residence. But in the years of the war against Iran, these units were transformed into a principal striking force of the Iraqi Army, and they played a decisive role in some of the battles, particularly the battle of al-Faw in 1988, which became the decisive battle and radical watershed in that war.

After the Iraq-Iran war, the Republican Guard units were augmented by outstanding men and officers from the other combat units.

According to estimates by U.S. intelligence, the Republican Guard units are comparable to those of the U.S. Army in terms of training and morale. Unlike all the other units of the Iraqi Army, the Republican Guard units were given glorious names such as the Babylon Division, Allahu Akbar Division, or Saladin Division, and so on so forth.

During the Gulf war, the coalition aircraft immediately targeted the positions of the Republican Guards. But these units succeeded in preserving their combat capabilities and later joined in the fighting in southern Iraq. The coalition forces could not rout them.

It must be stated also that fearing the defeat of the Republican Guard, coup attempts, or coalition forces parachuting into Baghdad, Saddam Husayn amassed some 60,000 members of these units on the outskirts of the Iraqi capital. They did not participate in the land battles.

[Correspondent] What do you think will be the fate of the aircraft sent by Iraq to Iran at the beginning of the war?

[Aleksandrov] At present there are about 139 Iraqi fighter planes in Iran. They include the best of the Iraqi Air Force Planes, such as the Soviet-made MiG-23 [as heard] and Su-24. I believe that the Iranian decision concerning these planes will be decided in light of the current events in Iraq. I also believe it is possible that Iran might not return these planes to Iraq but keep them as some sort of Iraqi reparation for Iran's losses in the Iraq-Iran war.

[Correspondent] We have often heard that the United States and its Western allies used the theater of operations as a testing ground for their modern weapons. What new weapons were used for the first time there?

[Aleksandrov] Frankly, the Arab area has been used as a testing ground for new U.S. weapons on more than one occasion. Let us recall the Arab-Israeli wars when the Israeli Army tested new U.S. weapons. In the 1982 Lebanon war alone, the Israeli Armed Forces tested over 100 new U.S. weapons, equipment, and munition.

During the Gulf war, the Americans used for the first time new types of air bombs called fuel bombs [qanabil al-sa'ilah] and cassette bombs [qanabil kasit]. The fuel bombs contain special inflammable liquid which filters into the air above the intended target. When the bomb explodes on the ground, the liquid ignites, burning the target. It also creates a high-pressure area and greatly reduces the amount of oxygen in the air, facing those in shelters with sure death. As to the Cassette bomb, it disperses a large number of small bombs and mines. This is in addition to winged Tomahawk missiles, which were also used for the first time. This is in addition to a large amount of electronic equipment and fighter planes such as the Stealth, which has never been used before in military operations.

It must be said that for the first time in the history of wars, the U.S. Armed Forces used air weapons on the widest possible scale. Even artificial satellites were launched in order to collect reconnaisance data for use by the U.S. command, and for pinpointing targets, making surveys, and so on.

[Correspondent] What was the price paid by the anti-Iraq coalition for its victory?

[Aleksandrov] According to official statements by the coalition forces command, the losses were very small—155 killed, 42 aircraft and 10 helicopters destroyed. Frankly, I am not sure about the veracity of these statements. Furthermore, there is the financial cost of the war. One day of the Desert Shield operation cost the United States $500 million. One day of the Desert Storm operation cost $1 billion. But the price paid by the anti-Iraq coalition exceeds these figures by far.

I am referring here to the ecological side. As is known, there are 950 oil wells in Kuwait, 600 of which are on fire. Daily 3 million barrels of oil are being burned and 750 tons of smoke soar into the air. The smoke clouds extend to a distance of 1600 km. According to ecological experts, at least six months are needed to put out the fires in Kuwait.

Furthermore, there is the problem of the polluted Gulf water. At present, about 11 million barrels of oil have flowed into the Gulf water. As is known, the Arab Gulf constitutes an important fishing zone. The pollution of the water and the bed of the Gulf might lead to the killing of the fish and the destruction of numerous types of fishes in the Gulf and the Indian Ocean in general. It is worth mentioning that the fish wealth of the Indian Ocean constitutes an indivisible part of the food of 2 million people in the world.

Generally speaking, the price of the victory is not confined to 155 killed, 42 planes, and 10 helicopters. The Gulf war has caused an ecological catastrophe, not just for the Gulf region alone, but for the whole world.

[Correspondent] What is the morale of the Iraqi Army today in your opinion?

[Aleksandrov] In my opinion, the morale of the troops is low, particularly those who withdrew from Kuwait and were exposed to continuous air attacks for several consecutive weeks. Furthermore, the clashes taking place in the Iraqi cities has adversely affected morale. As is known, some of the units have joined the opposition.

Most certainly, the position of the Iraqi Army these days constitutes a decisive factor in the development of political events in Iraq.

[Correspondent] What was the behavior of Arab volunteers in the Iraqi Army, and that of the Arab forces in the multinational force?

[Aleksandrov] According to information published in the Egyptian newspaper AL-WAFD last September, two divisions of Arab volunteers were formed in Iraq. These came from various Arab countries, including Saudi Arabia. They were trained in Iraqi camps near Kirkuk. It was planned to send these formations to Kuwait. But the world news agencies did not mention anything about the fate of these volunteers and their participation in the battles.

As to the Arab forces which fought within the framework of the coalition forces, they of course played a secondary role. Their tasks were limited. They centered on supporting the U.S. offensive. The U.S. aircraft played the principal role, and opened the way for the land forces, including the Arab units.

[Correspondent] There have been numerous allegations throughout the world that the war has proven the superiority of Western weapons over Soviet-made weapons. Is this true, in your opinion, doctor?

[Aleksandrov] These claims are wholly unfounded. The U.S. forces were equipped with the most modern weapons made in the past few years. It has been said, for example, that the Patriot anti-missile missiles have proven their absolute superiority over the Soviet Scud missiles, which were altered in Iraq with the help of German engineers. These missiles were altered some years ago in order to increase their range. The Iraqi missiles, which are known in the West as Scud, are actually not the original Scud missiles. These altered missiles are called Al-Anbat and Al-Husayn in Iraq.

Naturally, increasing the range has adversely affected the precision of the strike and destructive capabilities on targets. The enlargement of the fuel container in the missiles was achieved at the expense of reducing the combat materials. Nevertheless, it is not right to compare these missiles, which entered service with the Soviet Armed Forces in 1962, with the Patriot missiles, which entered service with the U.S. Armed Forces in the late 1980s. They are a new generation of weapons.

[Correspondent] How efficient were the Soviet-made weapons in this war?

[Aleksandrov] I wish to refer here to the statement made by Brigadier General Mustafa Talas, the defense minister of the Syrian Arab Republic, who paid an official visit to the USSR early last February. In his statement, Mustafa Talas said that the Soviet-made arms and equipment with which the Syrian Army is equipped have proven their high efficiency, particularly the armored vehicles. Unlike the engines of the sophisticated U.S. Abram tanks,. the engines of the Soviet—T-62 tanks have operated in a guaranteed manner in the sands of the Arabian peninsula desert. As to the Soviet-made aircraft, with which the Iraqi Air Forces are equipped, they have been kept away from the air battles. This is because the coalition air force was greatly superior to that of the Iraqi Air Force. Furthermore, the Iraqi Air Forces had some old aircraft such as the Su-16 and Su-7 bomber.

In short, it is not possible to provide any specific conclusion with regard to the combat aircraft.

Incidentally, a senior USSR defense ministry official stated last month that the Soviet Armed Forces possess weapons similar to most of the weapons used by the U.S. forces in the Gulf.

[Correspondent] The postwar political and military situation in the Gulf is characterized by the growth of the U.S. role. According to reports of received from Washington, the U.S. Administration is planning to keep at least one armored division, and arms, and equipment sufficient for two other divisions there. This is in addition to stationing one air wing or even two, and one or two aircraft carriers, plus U.S. warships. At present, plans are being drafted for joint maneuvers by the U.S., and Gulf Cooperation Council forces.

It must be said that the war has helped escalate the arms race in the region. Saudi Arabia, Egypt, the UAE, and Turkey have asked the United States to provide them with urgent military supplies until the end of the current year at a value of $33 billion. This represents an increase in the military expenditure of these countries by $2 billion over that of the past year.

Generally speaking, with regard to the creation of a military and political security system, the region member countries depend noticeably on Washington. Nevertheless, there is the possibility of creating a political and military bloc by the GCC, Egypt, and Syria, and the formation of a joint force from these countries to be stationed permanently in the Gulf countries.

In the final analysis, stability in the region will depend, in my opinion, on the resutls of the dramatic events now taking place in Iraq.

As a result of the two wars, Iraq is now in a desperate state. After the Iraq-Iran war, Iraq's debts amounted to $90 billion. Today Kuwait is asking Baghdad for $100 billion to compensate for the destruction caused by Iraq to Kuwait. This is in addition to the huge cost of reconstruction in iraq itself. Whereas the national income of Iraq does not exceed $17 billion.

We know very well that sharp economic crisis in any country inevitably leads to a deterioration of political and military conditions. Even if Saddam Husayn succeeds in holding on to power this time, the future economic problems will impose other political problems on this regime, particularly if we were to take into consideration the fact that the countries of the West and the Gulf do not wish to offer any economic or financial aid to the regime of Saddam Husayn.

As to the Shi'ite factor becoming an expected substitute for the current ruling regime, I believe that at present, the U.S. Administration and the other countries concerned are studying most carefully the likely political consequences of any seizure of power by the Shi'ite men of religion.

Of course, stability in the Gulf region is ipso facto extremely important. But what is more important, in my opinion, is the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which could bring peace and reassurance to the entire Arab area. This will positively affect the course of events

in the whole Arab world. I believe that all the parties concerned should realize this urgent vital matter most seriously.

Dzasokhov Meets With Syrian Enovy in Moscow

LD1403073991 Moscow TASS in English 0725 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS - Soviet legislature's Committee on International Affairs Chairman Alexander Dzasokhov met Syrian Ambassador to the Soviet Union Muhammad 'Isam al-Na'ib in Moscow on Wednesday to discuss the situation in the Near and Middle East and a post-crisis settlement in the Gulf.

Both leaders stressed the need for active efforts in the region to avert new aggressions, ensure a global settlement of Middle Eastern problems, especially the Arab-Israeli conflict, and to create an atmosphere of trust and security, using the experience accumulated in the European process.

Syria is deeply interested in the preservation of the Soviet Union as a united and powerful state, playing a major role in promoting positive changes in the world, al-Na'ib said.

The sides also discussed cooperation between the Soviet Union and Syria.

Minister Sums Up Damascus Economic Talks

LD1303183391 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Excerpts] A Soviet delegation led by Yuriy Seminov, Soviet minister of power and electrification, ended its visit to Syria last week. The delegation took part in the work of the Soviet-Syrian joint committee for economic, scientific, and technological cooperation. We have asked Yuriy Semenov to speak about the activity of the committee.

The Soviet minister said: The Soviet-Syrian committee discussed for five days the progress made in implementing various projects and the issues pertaining to the scope of cooperation. We visited a number of projects which are being created with the participation of the Soviet Union. The time for completing the construction of the Tishrin dam was the main issue at the committee's meeting.

It was decided to inaugurate the first unit in early November, and to install new power lines in Syria. [passage omitted]

The Soviet minister said that some issues at the meeting of the Soviet-Syrian committee were controversial because no comprehensive contract has been signed between us due to the differences in connection with the costs of Soviet equipment. The Syrians do not agree to the raising of prices by the Soviet Union. We talked to the Syrians about the changes underway in our country, with Soviet plant moving into the system of full economic independence, and this led to the emergence of new realistic prices in the market.

It is expected that a group of Syrian experts will come to the Soviet Union to continue with Soviet experts the work on preparing the contract and prices. Afterwards we will act in accordance with agreements. Yuriy Semenov also said: During the talks, we discussed with my Syrian counterpart Sabah Baqjaji the issues related to Soviet technical assistance. He asked me to examine the question of including this assistance in the Soviet five-year plan, and I explained to him that we now have no five-year plan, and that planning now is year by year. But we agreed on the construction of a number of projects in Syria over a number of years in the future. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, the Soviet Minister of power and electrification said that at the conclusion of its visit, the Soviet delegation met with Syrian Prime minister Mahmud al-Zu'bi. During the meeting, an extremely important issue for our country was touched on: The issue of Syria's repayment of its debts to the Soviet Union. The prime minister promised to discuss this issue in order to settle it. I believe that our future cooperation must take place on a purely commercial basis.

I must stress that the meetings with the Syrian prime minster, ministers, and workers were cordial despite the sensitive nature of the question of Syria's debt repayments, the minister said.

Deputy Defense Minister Visits India

LD1203015191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1507 GMT 11 Mar 91

[Text] Delhi, 11 Mar (TASS)—Admiral of the Fleet V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy and deputy minister of defense of the USSR, arrived in India today on an official visit. The visit is taking place at the invitation of Admiral L. Ramdas, chief of Navy staff of India.

A conversation took place between the military leaders. During the course of it questions of mutual interest were discussed.

East Europe

CSFR Anti-Soviet Campaign Marks Europe Shifts

PM1303140991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by V. Kosolapov: "The 'Prague Option' Again, or Who Benefits from Confrontation?"]

[Text] Fundamental changes occurred in relations between the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe on the threshold of the nineties. The free expression of the will of the peoples and their choice of a new path of

development were accompanied by substantial adjustments in those countries' foreign policy. The formerly special kind of relations of friendship and fraternity with the USSR, determined by common aims and tasks and mutual commitments in the Warsaw Pact and CEMA, made way for ordinary and sometimes markedly cool official ties signifying, as it were, regret for the former close cooperation. At the same time, the East European countries have been actively reorientating themselves toward partnership with the West and seeking approaches to its economic and military-political alliances.

We should clearly treat such a development calmly, regarding it as an inevitable consequence of the sociopolitical changes that have occurred in the countries of the former socialist community. Nevertheless the propaganda campaigns of an anti-Soviet and anti-Russian nature periodically organized in the countries of East Europe, based on conjecture, rumor, and juggling with facts, cannot but cause incomprehension. I would like to pay special attention to this phenomenon for the following reasons.

I was in Czechoslovakia for three years (from December 1986 through February 1990) as deputy leader of the USSR KGB mission at the CSFR Federal Interior Ministry and was able to draw up a pretty full picture of the nature of relations between our countries on various lines based upon mutual respect, equal rights, and noninterference in each other's affairs. Incidentally, the Soviet side did not diverge from these principles during the period of well-known events in Czechoslovakia in November 1989 either. The cooperation between our countries has substantially increased their ability to resolve political and economic tasks and has helped preserve peace in Europe in the last 45 years.

At the same time, slanderous campaigns to discredit the USSR and its policy are being waged with increasing frequency and frenzy in the CSFR and appeals made to launch a virtual "crusade" against the Soviet Union. Certain official representatives of the new authorities, including CSFR First Deputy Interior Minister J. Ruml, are playing a prominent role in the ballyhoo.

Ruml first attracted attention to himself last year in an interview entitled "State Security: The Prague Option" in the newspaper MOSKOVKSIYE NOVOSTI (No. 30), in which he sought to play up the myth about "KGB agents" penetrating the whole of Czechoslovakia. In February of that same year, in an interview in RZECZPOSPOLITA, he went even farther, claiming that in crisis situations certain groups of staffers of the former CSFR security service, in collaboration with the KGB, could destabilize the political situation in the country. According to Ruml this sinister conspiracy threatens not just the CSFR but also its neighbors, since the KGB has drawn up appropriate scenarios for the security services of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary and will scarcely leave them in peace.

Seeking to emerge from the narrow confines of his own department, Ruml is also scaring his fellow-citizens and the population of neighboring countries with a threat from the Soviet Union as a whole, for his statement that the CSFR, Poland, and Hungary should urgently reach agreement on a "system of defense in the face of Soviet danger" can be regarded in no other way.

I rejected Ruml's comments about "KGB agents" in the CSFR and certain other aspects of KGB activity in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA as not corresponding to reality. As a witness of the events in Czechoslovakia in November 1989, I can only confirm once again that the USSR KGB never drew up on any scenarios for Czechoslovakia for that event. I think that the same situation obtained in the other East European countries. Acting within the framework of the new approaches in foreign policy, the Soviet Union and its departments, of which the USSR KGB is one, have rigorously pursued a line of noninterference in Czechoslovakia, respecting its people's freedom of choice. This is well known to the new political leadership of the CSFR and Ruml himself, and not just from the highest-level statements by the Soviet side. The CSFR Main Military Prosecutor's Office came to the same conclusion, as its leader, Lieutenant Colonel M. Krizenecky, reported to the newspaper LIDOVE NOVINY on 15 November 1990.

Reflection on the causes of this new round of disinformation suggests that this whole campaign is being whipped up to divert attention from the socioeconomic problems which the Czechoslovak leadership have run into and to try to fashion an enemy image in the East to please the "new friends." This task is a quite thankless and very difficult one, in my opinion. An extremely unsuccesful choice of person to carry this out was made, in my view. Ruml's reply to my letter, which was also carried in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, speaks for itself. The lack of professionalism, the unsubstantiated nature of the claims, the contempt for history, and the idle conjecture about and abuse of his opponent do the author no credit and in no way increase confidence in his words.

I should say that such assessments are also shared by many sensible people in the CSFR. For example, Ruml's predecessor as first deputy interior minister, V. Ciklamini, at a news conference in Bratislava in January 1990 accused the present leadership of the Federal Interior Ministry of political predudice, utter professional incompetence, and a one-sided orientation toward the West.

I think that when Czechoslovakia and the other East European countries are searching for their new geopolitical place in Europe the desire to create an enemy image in the shape of the USSR and the calls for defense against the danger from the East can work in the interests of extremely reactionary and militarist forces in the West, but not at all the interests of the Czechoslovak people. The new Europe clearly needs not confrontation, but a search for points of contact and common interests

which, it seems to me, our countries have quite a lot of in view of their history, geographic proximity, economic interdependence, and the desire of the Soviet and Czechoslovak peoples to live in friendship and peace.

Troop Withdrawals From Hungary Talks Continue

LD1303132191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1856 GMT 12 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Zhirnikhin]

[Text] Budapest, 12 Mar (TASS)—USSR representatives responsible for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, Lieutenant General V.Ye. Shilov and I.P. Aboimov, USSR Ambassador to the Hungarian Republic, today visited Hungarian Prime Minister Josef Antall. During the meeting matters relating to the implementation of the troop withdrawal schedule were discussed. They also discussed unresolved property, financial, and economic problems, the settlement of which is envisaged by the Soviet-Hungarian intergovernmental agreement of 10 March 1990. It was agreed that the necessary measures will be taken to achieve mutually acceptable solutions as soon as possible.

West Europe

European Bank President Meets With Leaders

Discusses Ties With Gorbachev

LD1303180991 Moscow TASS in English 1633 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev received President of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development Jacques Attali in the Kremlin today.

Gorbachev welcomed the establishment of this new international banking institution co-founded by the Soviet Union. This is a great event in European development, he noted.

Attali expressed the bank's readiness to promote the implementation of ongoing sweeping changes in the USSR, stressing that the entire world is interested in their success.

The ability of the Soviet Union and its leadership to renovate the country is beyond any doubt, he said. Such renovation needs stability, Attali added. The forthcoming referendum on March 17 will create conditions to continue reforms.

Gorbachev again stressed the desire to continue and accelerte changes. "If we sometimes use administrative methods, we do this to keep the situation under control," he said.

"If we did not do this, we had to discontinue reforms. But we do not intend to make stops. On the contrary, our present plans provide for new moves concerning the creation of a firm legal basis for further changes and, simultaneously, for their implementation, including the stabilisation of the financial system and the rouble.

"This stabilisation will enable us to make the rouble convertible, which will create a new basis for cooperation with the outside world," Gorbachev stressed.

During the meeting, the sides discussed the economic and political aspects of cooperation between the bank and the Soviet Union.

Spheres of possible cooperation include the power industry, the improvement of infrastructure, the conversion of the munitions industry, assistance to privatisation and the establishment in the USSR of a new credit and financial institution—a bank for development and project financing.

The sides agreed to begin work, without losing time, in these and other spheres.

"We regard the development of cooperation in these spheres in the context of the construction of a greater Europe, stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals. This will help expand the possibilities of our continent," Gorbachev stressed.

Attali said that he fully supports this approach.

Meets With Pavlov

LD1403111591 Moscow TASS in English 1021 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov met Jacques Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) in the Kremlin on Wednesday. Attali is currently in Moscow at the head of an EBRD delegation to discuss prospects for the bank's cooperation with the Soviet Union, says a report circulated here today.

"It was pointed out during the conversation that the Soviet Union's participation in the activities of the EBRD, an agreement on the founding of which is to enter into force soon, should be viewed as an important step along the road of the country's integration into the world economy and its involvement in the international division of labour.

Cooperation with the EBRD will be of dual importance: firstly, it will promote the implementation of large-scale economic projects in the interests of development, and secondly, utilise the wide experience of international financial organisations for the establishment and adjustment of a market mechanism in the Soviet economy.

Having noted that it "is virtually the first time the Soviet Union enters into a direct contact with an international financial organisation, Pavlov outlined possible areas of cooperation with the EBRD.

Jacques Attali, speaking about prospects for cooperation between the EBRD and the USSR, associated it with

further "renewal of the Soviet economic system, primarily a price reform, the stabilisation of macroeconomic activities, privatisation, and turning state property over to other owners.

The Soviet side emphasised that the process of transformations in various spheres of the country's social life will continue, despite the difficulties being experienced by the country, and is irreversible.

Belonogov, EC Ambassadors Discuss Gulf Peace

LD1303184191 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Alexsandr Belonogov today met British ambassador to the Soviet Union Rodric Braithwaite to exchange views on the Persian Gulf situation and ways of the post-crisis settlement.

Also today, Belonogov discussed current many-sided efforts to radically change the situation in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East and create a dependable security system in the region during his meetings with Spanish Ambassador Jose Cuenca Anaya, Italian Ambassador Ferdinando Salleo, Portuguese Ambassador Antonio Leal da Costa Lobo and French Ambassador Bertrand Dufourcq.

On instructions from their governments, the ambassadors handed to the Soviet deputy foreign minister a joint document on the Conference for Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean.

Shevardnadze Makes Statement on USSR in Italy

LD1403093491 Moscow TASS in English 0915 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Tarakanov]

[Text] Rome March 14 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, president of the USSR Foreign Policy Association, former Soviet foreign minister, arrived here on Wednesday at the invitation of the Italian Society for International Organisation, Lucarini publishers and the Soviet-Italian joint venture "Novosti-Italia".

The programme of Shevardnadze's stay in Italy includes a conversation with Italian President Francesco Cossiga, and a meeting with National Secretary of the Democratic Left Forces Party Achille Occhetto. Shevardnadze will be received in the Vatican by Pope John Paul the Second.

In Rome Shevardnadze will present his book "The Crisis of Power and International Diplomacy", brought out in Italy by Lucarini publishers in collaboration with Novosti-Italia.

In a statement to reporters in the Rome airport, Shevardnadze said, specifically, that the Soviet Union should resolve without delay economic problems, since time is running out and this year will be decisive. Then it is necessary to resolve questions of ethnic relations by establishing new ties between separate republics and creating a new centre with taking into consideration the changes.

Shevardnadze believes there exists another problem: the struggle between the old forces which turn backwards and the democratic forces which strive for renewal. He said that, just as in any country, conservatives have a right to exist. As to reformers, their problem is the weakness of their ranks, and this important problem should be tackled.

French Official Reports on Humanitarian Aid

PM1103120991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "France-USSR"]

[Text] In the past two months France has given the Soviet Union humanitarian aid totaling 50 million francs [Fr], Bernard Kouchner, secretary of state for humanitarian activities to the French prime minister, reported Wednesday evening. The French Government has allocated Fr40 million, while the rest is made up of gifts from the cities of Strasbourg and Marseilles and also from individuals and organizations. Within the aid framework France has sent to the USSR 600 tonnes of powdered milk, 100 tonnes of baby food, and 65 sets of medical equipment and medicines for children's hospitals and clinics, each of which is aimed at providing help to 70,000 children.

Military Inspectors Arrive in Norway 12 Mar

LD1303052191 Moscow TASS in English 0500 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Under the provisions of the 1990 Vienna document of the talks on confidence- and security-building measures and cooperation in Europe, the Soviet Government applied to the Government of Norway on March 11 in a request for an inspection of military activities on Norwegian territory, it was officially announced here today.

Following a positive reply to the request, a group of Soviet military inspectors arrived in Norway on March 12 and began a tour of inspection.

Nuclear Test Consultations Held With Finns

PM0703104991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 91 Moscow Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 28 February Soviet-Finnish talks were held in Moscow on questions of ensuring safety during underground nuclear tests on the northern testing range (Novaya Zemlya island).

Political & Social

Gorbachev Appoints Security Council Members

LD1303185191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have just received a report that USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has issued decrees appointing comrades Gennadiy Ivanovich Yanayev; Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov; Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin; Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh; Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov; Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov; Boris Karlovich Pugo; and Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov members of the USSR Security Council.

Article Defends Gorbachev's Centrist Course

PM1303125191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Union Edition pp 1,3

[Otto Latsis article: "Masks; What Policy Do They Serve Today"]

[Excerpts] In classical theater masks were used as a means of direct and crude symbolism: There was Laughter, Sorrow, Good, and Evil. Political cliches similar to the classical masks are now multiplying on the stage of our public life. Masks symbolizing the problems instead of the problems themselves. These masks constitute frozen images of rough-hewn ideas—they act as a covering for every brand of populism. [passage omitted]

Democratic populism has a whole host of masks in store. The most popular being the President's Conspiracy Against Democracy. Effective logical corroboration is hard to come by, but this idea is being well circulated: We are not afraid of the president himself, can't you trust us?

A new branch of this splendid tree has put on a growth spurt of late—Communist populism. I want to talk about it in more detail today since there is also a recent authoritative item on it: I.K. Polozkov's report at the combined plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission 6 March.

We knew of the set of masks used by this author even earlier from his many utterances. The most popular being Defense of Socialism, Power of the Working People, and the Shady Bourgeoisie. I. Polozkov's speeches have been criticized on several occasions, but not always from scientific positions prescribing objective analysis of facts. There have been attacks from positions of democratic populism, yet this only strengthens Communist populism.

I must admit with regret that the democratic press nowadays is just as inclined as the bureaucratized press in days of old to think and speak in cliches. The only change being the set of cliches. Evil Lenin has taken the place of the Great Lenin, likewise 73 Years of Total Mistakes have replaced the Glorious Path, and instead of movement toward a Glorious Future for Mankind there is now a demand for a Return to Civilization. I. Polozkov does not have to work very hard to act as defender of Soviet values in the eyes of those who disagree with this gross over-simplification of the Soviet past and contemporary problems.

Of course, no sensible person can reiterate the dogma of the ensuing (as a result of Stalinist industrialization and collectivization) emergence of a society of social justice. Today we know plenty about how this socialism was built and how it really functioned. But a sensible person would not agree with the claim that the socialist idea has failed totally and that it lacked merit in the past and prospects for the future. The old cliches are not fit to provide a contemporary response to the question of socialism—neither in their original, apologetic form nor in their inverted—negativist—form. We can only see reality as it is by discarding all cliches. [passage omitted]

The most dangerous hurdle of economic reform—price rises—is at hand. If people are now on strike in some places, things will be harder in the future. The new Union Treaty is fighting its way through difficult obstacles. B.N. Yeltsin once again has deemed this a suitable moment to begin his attack on the president. (I am referring to his television interview demanding M.S. Gorbachev's resignation. A meeting of Russia's democratic forces was held after the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Plenum at which the attack was intensified and broadened. I now have before me on a sheet of paper just a few phrases that I caught from the radio report, which was, probably, incomplete. The very emergence of a new party on the country's political scene may prove useful—everything will depend on the direction it takes. N. Shmelev's sober words made a profound impression on me—"I am not sure that the silent majority has not already grown tired of all our political games"—along with those voiced by L. Batkin—"We must tell the population the whole truth not only about Gorbachev but also about ourselves, talk about our own impotence... Democrats have played too long." The words used in B. Yeltsin's speech struck an unpleasant note: Masks have appeared once again—"traitors," "enemies," "offensive," "front," "victory." Although there is truth in his criticism of the actions taken by the "center," I cannot see the kind of profound differences between his appeals and M.S. Gorbachev's policy that would justify the Russian leader's speech against the Union Treaty. But I think that B. Yeltsin's statement that the striking miners are "practically doing what has to be done" is simply a case of thoughtlessly playing with fire. However, I do not as yet have the full precise text of the speeches and the draft Charter, nor is there any time or room in this article to produce an exhaustive analysis of this event—I will refrain from general assessments).

In short, it is the moment where the general secretary may find himself both short on time and unable to

properly respond to I. Polozkov's attack on the perestroyka policy. Left unanswered, it will acquire a semblance of legality and become another reclaimed bridgehead in the policy of antiperestroyka revenge. Forms for future steps too will be found here. I. Polozkov "mooted" the idea of public salvation committees at the last RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee plenum. A public organization, a normal constitutional matter. But we already know of examples where they have been used in far from constitutional manner.

I would like to hope that this will not happen. No, I am not urging the president to personally intervene and stop this—he has enough other worries—and it is time for Communists themselves to learn to keep order in their own home. On the basis of numerous meetings in most varied party organizations I have become firmly convinced that most of Russia's Communists do not share I. Polozkov's neo-Stalinist policy and many are not leaving the party precisely in order to oppose this policy [from within]. Perhaps this may not succeed if the organized minority proves stronger than the disorganized majority. Perhaps, Ivan Kuzmich will be able to totally bend the RSFSR Communist Party to his will. It is then extremely likely that this party will totally lose its influence among the masses and suffer an all-out defeat in the next elections to the Soviets. Does the report's author really not realize this? Or is he counting on strong-arm instruments of policy? If that is the case, these are dangerous calculations. Not only in the event of failure, but also if all Communist populists' dreams come true. Czechoslovakia tried to escape from the difficulties of reform by restoring administrative fiat after 1968. It paid for this not only with stagnation but also with discredit for the idea of socialism and loss of prestige for the Communist Party—prestige that was boundless under Dubcek.

A society in which two extreme wings are gaining excessive strength while the political center is waning is in a dangerous position. I have no intention of justifying the entire policy pursued by the leader of the political center, he is not protected against mistakes. But he must not be accused of failing to totally satisfy every political force: The president must represent all society; it is not a sign of weakness on his part but his duty to seek compromises. Has he found the most genuinely centrist policy that can unite society and entice it to harmoniously resolve today's problems as happened two or three years ago? I am afraid that it is too early to say that. But the very idea of political centrism is highly opportune. If a firm political center develops, the activeness on the flanks may also turn out useful.

Gorbachev Receives Church Representatives

LD1303184191 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin today a group of religious figures at their request.

Heads and representatives of churches and religious organisations held a meeting in Moscow.

Speaking on behalf of the meeting's participants, Patriarch Aleksiy II of Moscow and All Russia handed to the president the text of their declaration.

Gorbachev informed the church figures about specific measures that are being undertaken by the state leadership to stabilise the political and economic situation in the country and deepen the process of democratic changes.

A frank and constructive conversation followed. It focused on the idea of the need to strengthen the unity of believers and non- believers in the interests of peace, civic and national accord, protection of the rights and liberties of the renewing federation.

Muslim Mufti Sends Message to Patriarch

PM1303160791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 p 1

[Unattributed report on message sent to Patriarch Aleksiy by the Mufti of Central Asia and Kazakhstan; date not given: "Al-Salam Alaykum, Patriarch"]

[Text] To Holy Patriarch Aleksiy II of Moscow and All the Russias.

Your Holiness!

We, the Muslims of Central Asia, are deeply concerned about the processes of interconfessional, interethnic, and ideological dissension currently under way in our country, and the activities of forces which sow alienation and enmity between each other and among the citizens of our Fatherland, which may lead people to an abyss in all spheres of life.

With due respect for this observation, we consider it expedient to gather together, talk, and direct our efforts toward overcoming negative phenomena in human relations, as we are convinced that the development of interdenominational contacts gives mankind greater possibilities for strengthening friendship and fraternity.

With deepest respect,

[Signed] Mufti Muhammad-Sadiq Muhammad-Yusuf, chairman of the Spiritual Administration of Central Asian and Kazakhstan Muslims and USSR people's deputy.

Editor's Note:

His Holiness the Mufti specifically asked for this short but very important message to be published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

Your newspaper, he said, deeply respects the feelings and aspirations not only of Christians but of Muslims too, acquainting the country in detail and without prejudice with present-day developments in the Soviet Union's

Muslim world. And it must be said that right now our country has over 50 million practicing Muslims—no more, no less....

Complex and multifaceted developments are taking place in the Central Asian republics today. Only peace and tranquillity can guarantee positive change in the future.

The Muslim leadership's proposal reflects primarily a longing for civil accord among people of different nationality and religion.

We hope that the proposal by the Mufti of the Central Asian and Kazakhstan Muslims will be heard and taken on board by His Holiness Patriarch Aleksiy II of Moscow and All the Russias.

It would not be presumptuous to expect a response to this peace-loving appeal.

Moscow Pickets Support Striking Miners

PM1303143891 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 p 1

[I. Shirokov report: "In Manezhnaya Square All Evening"]

[Text] TASS reports that at its routine session in Novokuznetsk the Kuzbass Council of Workers Committees called on the Kuzbass miners to hold an indefinite strike in support of political demands.

The labor collectives of four Don pits—the "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA," "Sokolovskaya," and the "Rostovugol" association's "Ayutinskaya" and "Glubokaya"—went back to work yesterday after a one-day warning strike.

Meanwhile

If some of the scribbling fraternity like to live by the principle "Not a day without a line!", the Muscovites have now apparently gone over to the method "Not a day without rallies and pickets!"

This time the site of the latest picket was Manezhnaya Square. The decision to hold it was adopted 10 March at a rally organized by "Democratic Russia." At that time some 400 people signed up for the picket line, agreeing to maintain a day and night vigil with placards.

The picketers' aim is to support the demands of the striking miners. Some 40-50 people are on constant duty in the square. Soon, to all appearances, the picket will become 24-hour, and so the organizers are feverishly looking for some premises close by to provide warmth in the night hours.

Next to the picket, funds are being collected energetically for the Fund for Aid to Striking Miners (incidentally, during the aforementioned rally in Manege Square more than 300,000 rubles was collected for this fund).

The picketers intend to stay put until the opening of the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies.

Procurator General Trubin on Referendum Law

91UN1056A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 9 Mar 91 p 2

[Interview with USSR Procurator General N.S. Trubin by TASS correspondent V. Zenkovich; place and date not given: "Referendum: Objective—a Renewed Union" subtitled "Adhering Strictly to the Law"]

[Text] [Zenkovich] As is known, the "war of laws" is not abating in our society. I would like to know which set will guide procurators in the supervision of observance of laws during the conduct of the 17 March referendum in the USSR?

[Trubin] The Fourth USSR Congress of People's Deputies decided that until the conclusion of a new Union treaty it will be necessary to be guided by the Constitution and legislation in effect. In addition, it is very important that procurators do not fall under the influence of public associations of citizens or local organs of authority. We paid particular attention to this at the recently held all-Union conference. Unfortunately, there are forces in our country that have come out against the conduct of a referendum. Thus, the Lithuanian leadership has declared that "starting on 11 March 1990, no laws or decrees of USSR authority are valid in Lithuania, and they do not obligate its people in any way."

The higher organs of authority of certain other republics have also come out for nonparticipation in the USSR referendum in violation of the Constitution and legislation of the USSR. By making such decisions they are actually depriving citizens of the right to participate in the management of their own country, proclaimed not only in our laws but also in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international documents. Therefore, the USSR Supreme Soviet considers all such decisions to be illegal and not subject to fulfillment. This was also affirmed by a recent announcement of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, published in the press.

Despite the obstacles that were put in the way by certain political forces, citizens whose rights have been infringed upon intend to participate in the referendum. In Lithuania, for example, electoral districts and precincts have already been determined, and electoral commissions have been established in many enterprises, organizations, and establishments, and also in military units. Preparatory work is being conducted by labor collectives and various public associations of citizens. At the recently held session of the Snechkus City Soviet of People's Deputies a decision was made to hold the USSR referendum on its own territory. In general, the refusal of some republic parliaments to conduct a nationwide vote on their own territory seems strange. For those who

made these decisions assert their adherence to the Declaration of Human Rights. But in doing so they for some reason forget that, having assumed the obligation to observe these norms, each of them must also assure each citizen the right to vote. As for a positive answer to the question of the referendum of residents of any republic, it does not abrogate the article of the USSR Constitution that guarantees free withdrawal from the USSR.

[Zenkovich] What responsibility has been established for the violation of USSR laws on the referendum?

[Trubin] In accordance with the Law on National Voting (USSR referendum), persons who hinder the free exercise by USSR citizens of their right to take part in the referendum in the country, and also officials of state or public organs, enterprises, institutions, organizations, members of an initiative group or commission of the referendum, and persons who conduct the collection of signatures who produce forged documents and upward distortions of results or who violate secret voting are punished with imprisonment for a term of up to five years or corrective labor for a term of up to two years, or a fine in an amount up to 5,000 rubles.

[Zenkovich] Nikolay Semenovich, and what will you do in the event that violations of the law are nonetheless committed during the referendum?

[Trubin] It they have an effect on its results, then according to the Law on Referendums I have the right to submit a representation to the Central Commission on the USSR Referendum, which is obliged to review it and make a decision either to conduct a second vote in the course of a month in those precincts (districts) where there were violations or to conduct a repeat election within the course of a year on the entire territory of the USSR. The question on the responsibility of those who are guilty must be resolved in accordance with legislation that is in effect.

Referendum 'No' Vote Considered Illogical

PM1303165191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences S. Saidkasimov under the rubric "On the Referendum": "Everyone Resolves the Fate of the Country. What Are We Going To Vote For?"]

[Text] The nationwide vote is the first and probably not the last union "measure" of its kind. There are plenty of gloomy predictions about its result. Although a significant majority of the public is expecting a positive result of the vote.

However, with the current instability you could also suppose that the referendum might have a negative result. That is, the idea of a voluntary union of sovereign republics might not be supported even if it is accompanied by the hope that it will be radically renewed. What awaits us in that event?

There are various kinds of separations. But who should separate and from whom? It is one thing if this is done by subjects that have all the attributes of autonomy, clearly see the real state of affairs, know what the score is in their relations, and keep a careful watch on reciprocal accounts and debts for years. Like, for example, the CEMA countries, they established fundamentally new forms and conditions of cooperation, and even this was by no means painless or free of economic shocks.

The situation within the USSR is another matter, as none of its subjects—and particularly none of its peoples, with their various rights and potentials—has actually known (and this is still the case) their true situation over the past decades, and this also relates to their fair share of everything that the country owns and has at its disposal. Correspondingly they do not have any idea of the material wealth they are parting with, that still has to be honestly established. Even if such claculations emerge, this will only be in the future and at the level of national state formations. But no one is in a position to count up the real achievements and losses of each nation, given that its representatives are scattered all around the country.

The paradox of history is that it is only possible for the republics and nations to separate—if such is their political will during the referendum—by uniting at present. Even if this is merely to resolve calmly and fairly the countless number of complex issues concerning the imminent "divorce," taking into acount all the circumstances of their long life together. I for one do not cherish any illusions about how easy it will be to share out the USSR's national wealth that was accumulated by joint efforts.

How could you divide the very large economic establishments, particularly the intellectual, scientific, and creative centers located in just a handful of cities, and finally the military potential of the country, its defense might, space industry, and so on? After all, huge amounts of money were put into creating them not by specific territorial formations, but all the country's peoples.

In such cases mutual accord is needed so as not to start confrontation involving force and bloody skirmishes, not to gain unnecessary enemies but to remain good partners for centuries to come. Because each of the peoples are fated to have their neighbors for ever.

The desire of the certain national leaders to "separate" immediately is not realistic. Especially as it contradicts the processes of democratization of interethnic relations. Many factors "silent" until that moment will make their presence felt at the very first attempt of this type. What is to happen if a union republic wants to leave the USSR but an autonomous formation contained in it wants to stay within in the framework of the Union? The complex situation that has arisen in Georgia and its autonomous formations clearly testifies to this very thing. Here the "diverity of categories" of nations taking shape immediately made itself felt, as did the differences in their

opportunities to implement their rights, and this includes the very fashionable right to separation. Attempts to violate the current integrity of republics will be enough to start the sharpest conflicts and bloodshed. Here just Moldova's example is more than indicative.

You cannot fail to acknowledge that the formation of new state entities after 1917 on the territory of the former Russian Empire was a subjective thing in many ways. The borders between them seemed to have been measured out "by eye." They were initially political symbols. In any case they were not state borders but administrative ones not enshrined in legal acts. As a result, border lines were quite easily changed. Entire tracts of land and large oblasts were transferred from one republic to another without any particular reason. As a result, the present gloomy reality—when existing borders rarely go undisputed—arose and became a basis for quarrels, armed conflicts, or actual war between neighboring nations.

Who, and on the basis of what unshakable criteria, can now establish absolutely precise republic borders that would please everyone? And particularly borders of the new conjectural national formations—and this means in the near future if the slogan "Peoples of the USSR, Separate" really does begin to operate. Here it is not just that deliberate attempts to do this can stir up millions of people in the regions, but every careless word or imprudent comparison or epithet.

It so happens that since it came into being, the concept of a "republic" has been associated with just its one eponymous nation.

Until now the term "national republics" has been actively used in official documents and in leaders' speeches. Hence the formation of a corresponding public opinion over decades. This is now promoting the growth of mass movements in the localities in defense of the de jure and de facto enshrinement of the primacy of republic's eponymous nation when resolving all fundamental questions on the given territory. It is clear that slogans of the type "Estonia for the Estonians" do not point the way to a democratic society. In such cases state sovereignty is equated with national sovereignty and even the sovereignty of a specific nation, which is by no means the same thing.

The desire to see only the one "indigenous" nation as the subject of the republic instead of all its people, or the totality of the citizens living there, contradicts world legal practice and ignores the fundamental provisions of international law. The right to self-determination is sometimes interpreted from these rather restricted positions—as if only the nation that gave a territory its name can have this right. This approach is alas a reality, although scarcely anyone would be able to show even the slightest relation between the idea of the "priority of the indigenous nation" and humanism, equal rights between peoples, human rights, and civilized behavior.

At the same time this does not mean that to obtain real equal rights, every nation living in a particular republic has to try and become a separate state. The experience of world development clearly shows that it is simply impossible for just one nation on a specific territory to embark on the path of achieving political supremacy.

It is extremely strange, of course, but with the existing automatic approach to this subject and distorted statistics, it is still the case today that contrary to elementary logic, people of nationalities other than the one that gave the republic its name, are indiscriminately counted as "non-indigenous" population. Although everyone knows that a number of nationalities have lived for centuries on the given territory. It was even stated at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies that it is quite wrong for almost 75 million people to be seen as living outside the boundaries of their original homelands according to the current national state structure. This is ridiculous from the point of view of scientific accuracy and historical justice.

Thus, on the basis of the 1989 population census, everyone believes that the proportion of people of non-indigenous nationality in the Ukraine, for instance, is 14 million. At first sight, this is a highly significant proportion—27 percent of its population. But it changes significantly if you take into account the fact that 11.4 million Russians are included in this figure. Is it logical to count as absolutely nonindigenous the Russians who have lived here together with the Ukrainians since time immemorial, and rank them along with the Azerbaijanis, for instance (40,000), or the Tajiks (4,400) who settled in the Ukrainian terrains very recently, literally before our very eyes?

Juggling with statistics means distorting the national structure of republics to the point of absurdity. An automatic approach in ethnodemographic analysis brings about extraordinary situations when even nations that have an autonomous formation within a union republic are not included among the indigenous inhabitants.

In interpreting calls for the disintegration of the USSR, it is inexcusable to forget about the balance of forces in the world community formed with such effort and with incredible sacrifices. Many people now think that this is no longer an argument, but an illusion of the past. But the formation of chaos in place of such a united and strong Union will inevitably lead to the polarization of the direct political, strategic, economic, and other interests of various states, primarily large powers and military blocs. Incidentally, this is being written about more in the West than here, and with increasing alarm.

Whatever the result of the vote, union-style relations between republics are unavoidable. Not one of them is in a position to carry on worthwhile and equal trade operations in the immediate future with the developed countries, apart from being able to offer them various—but cheap—unprocessed raw materials. There is more.

The low quality of most goods made in the republics means that we do not have any chance of selling them outside the borders of the USSR at the moment.

Another objective factor uniting the republics is that each of them, desiring peace and tranquillity for its citizens living outside its borders, is forced and obliged to negotiate with the others regarding the protection of those citizens.

It is never too late to separate. As a matter of fact, we have seen it all before in the difficult, intricate history of the USSR. But reason and the bitter experience of the peoples cautions us against driving ourselves into isolation, into an impasse.

The people should consciously decide their own fate by themselves.

Democratic Rallies Considered Subversive

PM1303161591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Viktor Kozhemyako article under the "Topic of the Day" rubric: "What Are They Struggling for? It Is Not for a Noble Aim That People are Gathering at Rallies"]

[Text] So once more the squares in a number of our cities have become an arena of noisy political drama. Once again they have resounded with hysterical cries and displayed the most scathing and sometimes even simply abusive slogans. The obvious question is: For what purpose?

Yes, the country has a host of difficult problems that must be resolved as soon as possible and by everyone, furthermore. You will recall that at the most difficult times people united and closed ranks to rebuild their damaged home. Everyone joined together in the difficult work of creation—and it seemed that the impossible became possible.

But now? Why are the troublemakers, both the well known and the unknown, bringing people together and influencing them accordingly? To undermine, to crush, and to sow even greater alarm and panic among the masses... Not to create but to bring down our already unstable society—such is their main aim. "Down with..!" is their favorite slogan. Power at any price—that is their cherished goal.

"Declare war"—that was the call that issued from the mouth of B. Yeltsin when he spoke at the House of Cinematographers the other day. On whom was he declaring war? No, not just the center, that has already become the hobbyhorse of the so-called "democrats." This is essentially a war on perestroyka, all our plans for the renewal of life, and civil peace and harmony. The worse it is the better—that is the unstated but central point of this entire destructive campaign and they are trying to involve as many people as possible.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to dupe people nowadays. Our correspondent reported: The crowd of roughly 60,000 people who gathered on Leningrad's Palace Square last Sunday soon dwindled to about 1,500-2,000. People were clearly disillusioned with what they heard from the platform and ostentatiously dispersed.

However, the "democratic" press continues to shout about the many hundreds of thousands who took part in the rallies. Perhaps that is because the demonstration, conceived and publicized as an all-Russian demonstration, flopped badly? Furthermore, no one counted these people; most often that is impossible anyway. Then again—what are these thousands compared with a people numbering many millions? A people who continue to work in shops and institute laboratories and are strenuously preparing for the spring sowing. It is only that labor, not the rending of the air with words, that can guarantee us prosperity in our homes and a peaceful, worthy life. The Russian is by nature diligent and kind, he has an innate dislike of the animosity certain forces in the power struggle are trying to fuel.

Have any radicals asked the people their real opinion on the situation in the country and its future? Our newspaper has already written how the "people's opinion" is often created. The collection of signatures "in defense of Yeltsin" that took place in Moscow, Sverdlovsk, Volgograd, and some other places is a clear indication of how cunningly and brazenly they deceive people. "Sign this, it is to improve your life," is how the latter-day emissaries try to convince people, developing their obscure but seemingly attractive appeals as they go along. That is precisely how they collected signatures and created the appearance of unanimous approval during the lamentable times of stagnation and even earlier than that—in the times of Stalin and Beria. Are they really dragging us back to that bitter past again?

The time chosen for the latest wave of well organized rallies to break was, of course, no coincidence. We are on the eve of a referendum designed to determine the future of our renewed Union. A truly portentous moment! How the various destructive and separatist forces would like to wreck the nationwide poll or at least hinder it. They would like this great country to disintegrate into apanage principalities just as they would like the state created over centuries to splinter into tiny pieces and cease to exist. But will that really improve matters for people of any nationality, whose strength and power lay in their mutual aid and unity? Is it really happiness and not disaster that awaits them if the dubious "people's champions" achieve the split they are struggling to acheive by fueling passions?

A base and vile aim, unworthy methods...

Vocal Anti-Union Anarchists Criticized

PM1303145591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Gennadiy Seleznev article under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "Moment of Truth"]

[Text] For the first time the brief history of our state confronts each of us with Hamlet's question: "To be or not to be?" But even the great Shakespeare's genius could not have imagined how difficult the day, how complex the situation, or how vast the state would be where people would find themselves facing the choice of their destiny. Strike out the word "yes" and the passions that explode, the conflagrations that rage, and the ethnic conflicts that erupt will be such that if the classic had known about this he would surely not have presented mankind with his great adage. Because neither he, nor those before him, nor those who followed the genius of world culture bequeathed people calamity or channeled their talent into blood and human tears. But whoever heeds the wise today, who examines his own or other people's history...

Many people have become so narrow-minded and primitive that they are ready to link the country's fate to the names of politicians and to the presence or absence of sausage in the stores. Has the Almighty robbed the people who occupy one-sixth of our planet of their wits? It seems so. It seems that part of our society has still not emerged from the hypnotic trance of last year's election campaign and with eyes blindfolded and ears plugged is again wandering the streets and squares uttering the same incantations. It is all very well for those professional rabble-rousers with their remunerative [deputy's] lapel badges who do not know how to work but know how to destroy everything. They cursed history, their forefathers, and their own past long ago. Give thanks at least for the fact that they have acted honestly and openly here. Why pour shame on them? Shame and conscience are an illusion to them.

In immoral fashion and following their own or someone else's plan they are trying to destroy a state still considered a great power by the world.

They change their views according to political circumstance and use credulous people as extras in their monstrous political show.

They have everything: free travel around the country, numerous trips to wealthy countries, dachas and limousines, food allowances, deputies' immunity, and pay that exceeds the miner's hard-earned wage.

They have not done anything useful for their people yet but are quick to blame their inactivity on someone else. Just listen to their speeches and appeals, read their articles and reports: You will not find anything to do with good, creation, or unity there. What you will find is such malice, such ambition, such calls to destruction. The rabble-rousers left the capital's Manezhskaya Square 10 March to the accompaniment of the words of the song: "Pass the ammunition, Lieutenant Golitsyn..." You can be sure that they will!

They are already accustoming society to the idea of the inevitability of civil war. Dogged Soviet power and the Communists are still resisting, and calling for peace and the unity of the peoples but Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, measuring himself up for the role of future Russian president, seems to have predetermined the fate of that power himself already. At least he stated in his speech at the Cinematographers' House that he is ready to put agents and representatives loyal to him personally in place. They will pursue his policy. There is "democracy" for you.

So, fellow countrymen, let us consider. It is all too serious. It is not the rulers, the parties, or the parliaments determining our choice on 17 March but we ourselves. We will decide not only for ourselves but for our children and our grandchildren. The historical moment of truth will arrive at that moment when the polling booth curtain draws shut behind each of us. May it be as quiet as the confessional in that booth, may the din of the squares and meetings and the oaths of loyalty to various movements, groups, and parties be left out there on the busy street. In here no decision must be made out of spite or to benefit someone. In here a personal choice is made. If reason is clouded by grudges or deep grief and baulks at striking out the word "no," then at least may the instinct of self-preservation operate. May our history not end with us.

Ethnic Germans Decide To Hold Congress

PM1303133191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 p 3

[Report by G. Grout, chairman of the all-Union society "Revival:" "The Congress Will Be Held All the Same"]

[Text] The Congress of Soviet Germans will be held after all. This was the decision adopted by the leadership of "Revival," the all-Union society of Soviet Germans. On 7 March 1991, four days before the beginning of the first congress, which was announced a full two months ago, the state commission and organizational committee had backed out from holding it. The reason for this was the coincidence which allegedly suddenly came to light of the congress' dates and the USSR referendum, and the delay in the USSR Supreme Soviet's adoption of the resolution repealing Stalin's laws regarding the peoples who were violently subjected to forced resettlement. However, "Revival's" Board says that the real reason is quite different—the incompatibility of the views of the majority of the delegates with the opinion of the congress organizational committee and the State Commission on the Problems of Soviet Germans. The delegates insist on the restoration of the illegally abolished autonomous republic in the Volga region, whereas the organizational committee and the state committee are recommending to them for the umpteenth time to restrict themselves to

national-cultural autonomy. Anxious for the fate of its people, the society for Soviet Germans "Revival" decided not to agree to the postponement. The First Congress of USSR Germans will begin 12 March 1991 in Moscow.

Forum Begins in Moscow

LD1303150191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1658 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Summary] Moscow, 12 Mar (TASS)—"The forum of Soviet Germans, whose participants have declared it the first extraordinary congress of Germans of the USSR, opened in Moscow today in spite of the decision of the State Commission on the problems of Soviet Germans to postpone the congress."

Genrikh Grout, the chairman of the All-Union Council of Soviet Germans, told a TASS correspondent that more than half of the 1019 elected delegates had arrived, and about 100 more are expected tomorrow. The congress will last until 15 March and discuss the rehabilitation of the Germans.

A resolution adopted by the delegates today condemns the position of the USSR leadership toward the restoration of territorial autonomy for the Soviet Germans. They feel the issue is being delayed groundlessly. The document also announces the creation of a new organizing committee for holding the congress.

In conversation with a TASS correspondent, Genrikh Grout noted that the main task of the congress is to express the will of the people to restore the republic of Soviet Germans in the Volga area and also to elect the governing structures which will deal in the future with the whole package of problems facing the Germans of the USSR. According to him, the congress rejects plans and proposals to set up an association or self-rule without territory.

The complexity of the situation over the holding of the current forum was demonstrated by the position of the "old" organizing committee for preparing the Congress of Soviet Germans, which was read out. It had been involved in its preparation for the last six months and declared the congress "invalid." Yuriy Gaar, deputy chairman of the organizing committee, told a TASS correspondent that whatever decisions the current congress made, "they would not have juridical force". But Yuriy Gaar sees the main difficulty in the fact that neither the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and RSFSR, nor their governments, had yet given any guarantees making it possible to count realistically on a solution to the question of the restoration of the statehood of Soviet Germans.

Congress Appeals to Pavlov

LD1403065191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 13 mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—A demand that the State Committee for the Problems of Soviet Germans, and the previous organizing committee for preparing the congress, be disbanded as "not having coped with the tasks entrusted to them" is contained in an appeal to USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, that was adopted at the first extraordinary Congress of USSR Germans currently taking place here. The document also stresses the need for the future representative body elected by the congress to deal with issues unique to Soviet Germans. Today they will discuss and adopt important resolutions at the congress—a declaration of the Congress of USSR Germans, and a statute on the provisional Council for the Restoration of the Volga-German Republic—and to elect its leading bodies.

The statement made today by the Credentials Commission stating that 505 delegates of the 970 people elected at the moment of its convocation are attending the congress resulted in a unusual situation. Altogether 1038 should have been elected to the congress from among the 2 million Germans of the USSR. Should not a wider circle of delegates have been assembled for the discussion of such important questions as ways for restoring Soviet Germans' statehood, of preserving and developing their culture, traditions, and language?

As the TASS correspondent was told by Iosif Tsimmerman, the leader of the press service of the congress, the presence of the greater proportion of the elected delegates, and also the fact that the arrival of new delegations is still being expected, is giving the organizers of the present forum grounds to claim that it is being held competently, and speaking competently, on behalf of all Germans.

The feeling of people who for almost 50 years have been awaiting the restoration of their territorial autonomy and the settlement of their legitimate demands are perfectly understandable, and the participants in the congress are now discussing them. Yet Gugo Vormsbekher, the deputy chairman of the "previous" organizing committee of the congress, stated to the TASS correspondent that given the current situation, it would be better not to confront state bodies and organizing committees that for half a year now have been preparing the holding of the congress and its draft documents, but to jointly look for ways of settling the problems of Soviet Germans.

Ryzhkov, Pavlov Interviews Contrasted

LD1303105591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1555 GMT 12 Mar 91

Recorded interviews with USSR Premier Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov and former USSR Premier Nikolay

Ivanovich Ryzhkov at their respective country dachas by journliasts Nikolay Krivomazov and Stanislav Pribylov from the "PRAVDA Street" program.]

[Text] [Krivomazov] Nikolay Ivanovich, people today are recalling your words more and more, if you remember them, about that government. Hardly a day goes past without one paper or another, on one pretext or another—even I myself sometimes, willy-nilly—really begin to recall your government, or perhaps because one is getting older, you see. Usually you think that the grass was greener not so long ago. Or were you right?

[Ryzhkov] I don't regret saying those words then. I can't now fail to think about what has happened in the past year and a half, why this situation arisen. I analyze, and think, and will go on thinking about it, as a person, as a former head of government. You know, we somehow collected together leading sociologists, including Tatyana Ivanovna Zaslavskaya, and a number of other leading sociologists, from Moscow, from the regions. I remember there was a bright comrade from Novosibirsk. We gathered them purposely so as to have a talk—where we were making mistakes, how we ought to behave; that is, to take a look at a sociological cross section of our society, at our actions. The conversation was quite interesting, but I recall—I can't remember whose expression it was, one of them—he said: Your government, Comrade Ryzhkov, seems to be tragi-heroic. I asked him: Why tragi-heroic? Well, heroic because over these eighteen months, that is, the period of the new government's formation, we had made very serious proposals for the radical reform of our economy, very serious ones. I think that since 1965, although it's not similar, in general—some elements are like 1965—this was the first time there had been such a global turn toward new radical changes in the economy.

So it wasn't so far to embark on this. People who were simply weak wouldn't embark on this; they would sit like that, arms folded, let everything take its own course; life's easier, there'll be less criticism, and we'll gradually make progress. But we, knowing that it wouldn't be so far ahead, embarked on this job. In May last year when I mounted the platform with the program for switching to the market, I said subsequently—and I can repeat it now—this was, perhaps, the most difficult report in my life. I went to the platform as if I were mounting the scaffold. I knew that after this there would be a storm—there would be a storm everywhere, a storm in society, a storm among all the people. There would be misunderstanding—the whole works; I understood this. So, I really went to the platform in such a state—although I wasn't afraid. I went consciously, knowing all the consequences.

A year and a half ago, there actually began a new life in the country, a new movement toward democracy, toward a new social system. For three years we had been conducting theoretical research in the country. We talked; we talked about all the positions, we made some kind of approaches to the job. Then new structures appeared, the Congress of People's Deputies, parliament, which, you know, is not a parliament at all, it's supreme state power. Then, in March 1990, there was presidential rule, and so on. So during these eighteen months there was in progress the formation of a totally new structure of power. [Video cuts to Pavlov interview]

[Pavlov] Generally speaking, today the main task of the country's leadership on any level is to tackle not only and not so much today's problems; because if you are going to go on like this all the time, a problem crops up, that means one starts to rake it aside; snow has fallen and one starts to clear it away and so forth. Today one should make a slight detour and take a look ahead somewhat, because we should work at getting ahead of events—or simply as they do in basketball, which they were just broadcasting there, at intercepting the ball.

[Pribylov] We know about the first interception of the ball by Valentin Pavlov. Generally speaking, given the conditions of a crisis any actions by a prime minister ought to be unpopular.

[Pavlov] Well, you know, in general I respect strong enemies. They allow themselves to be rechecked generally. If he is open about it, if he is an enemy and not simply a scoundrel.

[Pribylov] But what about friends?

[Pavlov] What about friends?

[Pribylov] Who is the closest of your friends?

[Pavlov] I have very few friends who are close like that. My friends are those that have remained since my time at the institute, since the times of the basketball team. That is how it is. That is how our relations, so to speak, took shape. You know how it is with a group of people, the men who played and the women who played on the same team. Thus, there are a few families. We got married. Even now we sometimes laugh about it. We used to tell fortunes. It was in the cards that my friend's wife should be my wife; I should have married her, and he should have married my wife. So, ever since we have laughed about it and we say: Look, there is no way that the forecast will come true. More than thirty years have passed. You know, if you ask me, I don't even know the year of birth of this or that person who is working with me; I have never taken any interest. In general I don't like looking at questionaires; I prefer to look a person in the eye.

[Pribylov] Sometimes you can't see everything in people's eyes, what lies in the soul.

[Pavlov] Well, in this case, it can be put simply. There should be one principle: there can be no faith in him who has once betrayed. [Video cuts to Ryzhkov interview]

[Krivomazov] There are a lot of letters, and you read them, and at times you yourself think—a kind of feeling; you understand that it isn't true, but that you somehow miscalculated somewhere, you lost somewhere. I lived in

Siberia; I could build a dacha for R2,000. I didn't manage it; there was no time. I lived on in Angara; you could buy a Moskvich [car] on credit. Now there is neither a Moskvich nor credit—and it seems there probably won't even be the possibility for a Soviet journalist or the majority of Soviet people who write to a communist newspaper. It's a feeling that you have miscalculated, and those who want to live, who were able to get by, and got the better at that time, with a dacha and with a car, and managed to buy furniture—what about this? There are many such thoughts in the country, and more and more are appearing. How can the seeds of bright hope be sown when we haven't managed to build a dacha? After all, you too didn't manage to build a dacha.

[Ryzhkov] Yes.

[Krivomazov] You didn't manage to plant a garden. Excuse me, I think it isn't appropriate to set up a garden on a state dacha?

[Ryzhkov] You can, but it would be a state garden.

[Krivomazov] It would be a state garden. You didn't build your bath house?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, yes.

[Krivomazov] Incidentally, will you have to give up the bath house?

[Ryzhkov] No, they say it's OK in a few months. I asked them this question, I said: Will I be able to go to the bath house or not? They said a few months will pass, so I'm not losing hope, I'm not losing hope.

[Krivomazov] Yet I want to say that the prime minister, too, and not just the prime minister—thoughts abound in Moscow that previously you had all the hassel, you had to fight and grab, then you could live well; but now they've missed the boat. Perhaps you can't speak for the whole country, but as a recent prime minister: We've lost something, you and I.

[Ryzhkov] We have lost in our honesty; that's where we've lost. And I think that we haven't lost—although in everyday terms, to be frank, of course, we have lost. We are one generation, people, and so, indeed, when you start to think—what am I?—a director, a former director of Uralmash, where there's about 50,000 people.

[Krivomazov] And no off days?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, nothing, not a day or a night. But of course I could build a dacha, any kind I liked, evidently there were such opportunities, and the social situation in the oblast there. But nevertheless, you know, our morals didn't allow us to go and grab—these grabbing instincts, when you have to grab and grab. Of course, there were people who grabbed; they could never get by without it. But still, the greater part of the leaders and the people conducted themselves to a certain extent more modestly. Haven't you noticed that nowadays, the richer a person is, the more he has, as they say. He used to conceal it, didn't he? Today this is becoming the moral norm. Look how rich he is! He's a millionaire! And so on. Isn't that a change in morals?

[Krivomazov] The trouble it took Ostap Bender to look for the underground millionaire Koreyko, who lived on 47 rubles and concealed his millions!

[Ryzhkov] It's clear that the market will of course introduce some stratification into those areas where things have been brought close to the median. That is absolutely clear. Once we've gone for the market, that is going to happen, a certain variation, a certain distinction. Let's take other countries. Let's take Sweden. I was there on an official visit two years ago, and I asked what the difference was between the person on minimum pay and the person on maximum pay. Do you have people who are indeed more wealthy to an enormous extent? Nothing of the kind! The difference is a factor of four—no more than that. The difference is a factor of four. I am not therefore in favor of our levelling things out, and that is not going to take place. That's all there is to it; it shouldn't be done because ti means the end of progress. But all the same, in the moral sense, when we present all this in the mass media today as a great boon of ours, that one person is a millionaire and that one a weaving operative—I think all the same these changes have to be made.

[Krivomazov] Russian merchants—excuse me—Russian merchants used to say profit comes to top of everything, but honor comes on top of profit.

[Ryzhkov] Quite right.

[Krivomazov] I think we have now crossed out completely that upper part.

[Ryzhkov] Well, I'm saying that if we engage in bravado today, boasting that a new millionaire has made his appearance, and that this millionaire could be elected a people's deputy—well doesn't this confirm your words? It does confirm them. I think, all the same, sooner or later in this respect people—and we ourselves to a certain extent—will make a definite reappraisal. This is dangerous, this is a very dangerous thing. But let's not grieve over the fact that things have turned out like that for us and for you. [Video cuts to Pavlov interview]

[Pavlov] Well, have you any idea what the Trifonovskaya Ulitsa is like?

[Pribylov] Yes, it's near the Prospekt Mira, yes.

[Pavlov] That is where I was born and grew up.

[Pribylov] The house on the Pervaya Mechchanskaya at the end? [quotation from a ballad by Vysotskiy]

[Pavlov] Yes, but it was actually on the Tretyaya Meshchanskaya. Perhaps those days of my childhood left their mark, so to speak, on the character of those who were growing up at that time. In the main we were left to our own devices, and we therefore became accustomed to act

as we wanted, to go where we wanted, to ask who we wanted to stick up for us. Those are your friends, there you are yourself, and that's all there is to it. And so Tolstoyism somehow or other did not find a response in me.

Generally speaking, in this respect I was always impressed by the action so of Vitte [Sergey Vitte, Russian finance minister toward the end of the 19th century]. You know I was always impressed by his resolve in principle to recognize realities, and proceeding from these realities to act without regard to the fact that you know perfectly well you are going to be accused of things: that you are reproached, that you have sold someone out, that you have betrayed someone, that you have done something to the detriment of something else. But if you see the ultimate goal and you are sure that it is a benefit, then you mustn't waver. [video cuts to Ryzhkov interview]

[Ryzhkov] I tried at least always to maintain a centrist position, a centrist position, not because I used to accommodate myself, and not because I want to be at the center and not disturb the ones on this side or the other, because I knew I had to disturb both of them and that both of them were disturbing me. I understood that one had nevertheless to implement very well- considered policies. In a state like ours one cannot ... if we have no fear of shocks, of course, social shocks ... making such sharp changes in direction is very dangerous. Perhaps many people have accused me, saying there he is, he lacks confidence, he's frightened of something. I wasn't afraid of anything. I'm not the kind of person who's afraid. I was afraid of one thing, of destroying the country, of taking it further into the abyss. That's what I was afraid of, and still am afraid of now.

[Krivomazov] Nikolay Ivanovich, perhaps what is needed in the office of prime minister is less human warmth and more toughness, so that prime ministers and perhaps the country do not get heart attacks—the degree of warmth in that lofty post you used to occupy?

[Ryzhkov] Well, I thought too about what had happened to me. After all, why I, an absolutely healthy man who had never had a serious illness apart from everyday illnesses such as flu, a runny nose, and so on, why this [heart attack] had happened suddenly. And the question you are asking me strikes something of a chord. It seems I had been taking too many things close to heart. I think that a prime minister must not be heartless, he must not. First of all, the leader of government or a prime minister must be a decent man, after all. A man who has no heart, as the saying goes, must not work for the people. One cannot have two hearts, you see, one cannot have two hearts—one for himself, for the family, and for a certain circle; and the other one for everybody else. This simply should not be done. One cannot have two hearts. There must be one heart.

[Krivomazov] Nikolay Ivanovich, when I learned where your study was and where Stalin's study was ... one drives past and sees the very same window that used to be lit up for 24 hours a day. The last time I was passing under that window and thought: What is the purpose of our life on this earth? After all, you have not had a private life ...

[Ryzhkov] Well ...

[Krivomazov] Why is there such a feeling that we live to work, whereas sometimes one would like it to be the other way around?

[Ryzhkov] Well, Nikolay Pavlovich, this is a philosophical question, on the whole ...

[Krivomazov] Half of the books you have here are on philosophy: Vernadskiy, [name indistinct].

[Ryzhkov] Yes, I have quite a few of them, yes. Once I started reading Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadskiy, but then I did not have time for that; and this is not a kind of literature one reads easily. You see, perhaps, the human aspiration for work and learning is a natural process. Speaking about my work or about the work and life of people like myself—state leaders or, say, heads of factories or, well, of all bodies of power who work very much, until 11 or 12 [at night]—it seems to me that, after all, there are very deep roots here, roots running in our system, in my view, in our socioeconomic system. I think these roots originated as early as in the period of war communism, then a certain modernization followed in the 1930's. Well, one should specifically cross out the war, one cannot even draw any parallels here and so on. That is, everything, the whole system was built ... well, now it is being called the command and administration system. Honestly speaking, I think these words have been used too often of late, on the whole, and perhaps another formula should have been found. Administration was and will remain ...

[Krivomazov] And it must exist.

[Ryzhkov] And it must exist. If there is a state, organized society, there was and will be administration. However, there is such a formula today and it has been widely used. So this command and administration system, say, a system of rigid planning, a system of reporting back when everything was detailed—how many shirts needed to be sown, how many needles, excavators, or everything had to be manufactured, willy-nily all that was operated, from top to bottom, by commands and responses. Therefore, all that responsibility was placed on people. There is a task to be fulfilled, so fulfill it; and the whole system was designed in precisely that fashion. Have you asked yourself the following question: Why in Italy—I may make a mistake as to the precise figure, but I will be right to the nearest ten—have not less than 40 governments changed in the postwar period?

I do not know how many of them there have been now—45 or may be 40. But, on the whole, above 40 is correct; there have been more than 40 changes of government, between 40 and 50. But life in the country goes

on. I am not saying that it is flourishing; it does have problems of its own, but life in the country goes on. This is because life there goes on according to tried and tested laws of one kind or another, norms of one kind or another that are added to and undergo changes; but society, industry, the economy, the whole life of society—these go on. Governments change, but the country does not die, as it were, due to that. I mean, here is where the reason lies.

I think this will come about at some point in the future, that precisely the government and leaders of any rank, and especially the government, should occupy themselves more with politics—let us say social and economic policies, foreign economic policies. So that they deal more with these questions, you know, so that there are laws, observance of the laws, the working out of these in politics. Then you do not need to sit there day and night and begin, as they say, to say: You do this, you do that. It is the system that ought to be functioning, the system.

By education, I am an engineer. It is only during the last 10 or perhaps 15 years that I became engrossed in more global economics, more global processes, and that is why I always say that any system, even a bad one, works better than no system at all. This is a self-evident truth. That is why I think everything ought to change once we have properly adjusted this mechanism of ours that proceeds now difficulty. But, for the time being, the system is, unfortunately, what it is; and, correspondingly, it requires, adequately requires, well, I mean, such actions and leaders. [video cuts to Pavlov interview]

[Pribylov] Is there a country or a place you like best of all, one you cannot forget and often want to visit?

[Pavlov] Well, I have not, all in all, stopped to think about it. But, generally speaking, you know, it is San Francisco that made the most pleasant impression, the most pleasant impression on me, although I was there literally ... [fails to finish]

I have been going swimming for many years now. It is the only thing which, generally speaking, allows me to withstand all this bedlam and psychological and other burdens to some small extent. I reckon that, all the same, I must swim a minimum of 600 or 700 meters a day.

[Pribylov] During the day?

[Pavlov] Well, in the morning.

I became convinced by my own example that depending on your age and the situation you may find yourself, you read each book in a different way. I have read, with satisfaction, the "Perom i Shpagoy."

[Pribylov] By Pikul?

[Pavlov] By Pikul?

[Pavlov] By Pikul. Well, maybe because our country's history is now so close to all these moments, but it has, I suppose, been given a new twist, but it is, generally speaking, not a bad thing at all. Many things, precisely how they took place in our history and what some leaders or others of the Russian Empire, let us say, or of, so to put it, other countries were, so to put it, guided by, because all in all the global, geo-political motives, as you yourself understand, they recur very often. [sentence as heard]

[Pribylov] Your first step as prime minister was to go on the attack. Is attack you philosophy of life?

[Pavlov] You know, by and large I am a man who is convinced of one thing in life—you don't triumph in defense. If you want to win you must attack.

[Pribylov] But on the other hand our state has come under attack so often—both from outside and inside—and the people have suffered so much, that perhaps it would be better to resolve certain issues some other way.

[Pavlov] They are suffering even now basically because we retreat all the time and don't act. We still want everything to take shape by itself, but nothing takes shape by itself.

I am in favor of understanding what strength is. I am not saying that you have to seize a person by the throat or tell him to get on and do it. In that case, you would need at least just as many people to do the seizing as you would to do the doing. [video cuts to Ryzhkov interview]

[Krivomazov] Tell me, what was it like working with Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] in the Urals? I just want to ask you to recall what work was like in those days.

[Ryzhkov] You know, I have to disappoint you a bit. In practice, I didn't work with him much there. I have the feeling that he is a man who loves power, very much so, and, speaking generally, he does not have the qualities of a major leader. He simply does not have the qualities. If he is listening to me—he has mentioned my name quite a lot, as they say, he even remembered me the last time—he does not have the qualities of a major leader. I think he is somebody accidental, who has now appeared on the Union horizon, the Russian horizon, on a certain wave. People will work it out. [video cuts to Pavlov interview]

[Pavlov] If you want to do something, you have to explain it in one form or another and say that you really want to do good. But if you try to explain that you want to do good for everybody, it won't work.

[Pribylov] Someone is bound to suffer, right?

[Pavlov] How can it be otherwise?

[Pribylov] And how, from your viewpoint, is one to determine whose interests takes precedence?

[Pavlov] Well, this is always expressed very simply: The majority benefits from that. If the majority is better off as a result of that, then you can act in the name of that. [video cuts to Ryzhkov interview]

(Krivomazov] Nikolay Ivanovich, what do you think, how much time will be needed for us to begin to have a bearable life again? Here, when I say bearable and tolerable, I do not just mean the empty stomachs, but our thoroughly ravaged souls. We are somehow oblivious of these aspects, and we talk more and more on the level of our stomachs. Will two generations of what Lenin referred to as the gentry that has forgotten what fear is be needed, or will things go a bit faster?

[Ryzhkov] Given the political situation that exists at present—and this political situation is, unfortunately, not improving—it is absurd to think of setting the economy to rights; it is an illusion, an illusion. Is it possible to tear the economy away from politics? It is necessary, it is necessary to have a clear-cut definition regarding our political line. If this war of laws persists—and we have been talking of this—if all manner of decisions, laws continue to be adopted, contradicting one another, when, I mean, well I am not against sovereignty; I am confident, I mean, that we shall proceed along this cause, but we must arrive at a definition, a definition and say: Here is sovereignty, and the republic has such and such rights, including these economic rights, and then everything will fall into place.

But today there is such a political situation, that, practically, to develop in this environment—in this politicial environment—it will be very difficult for the economy to develop normally. Therefore, in the first place, it is necessary to stabilize the political situation.

TSN Anchorman on News Censorshop

PM1303150891 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 p 1

[M. Degtyar report: "Cadres Decided Everything: This 'Service' Is Dangerous, Difficult, and, at First 'Glance' ['Vzglyad'], Invisible"]

[Text] Yesterday night's TSN program bore little resemblance to the familiar dynamic news program, that has become unique against the background of the recent excessively traditional programs on Central Television. It was more like a parody of a news cross section of the day.

What happened?

On Monday evening the chief releasing officer—that is the tactful name that the TV censors have been given in the days of glasnost—took all the material from the program in preparation to chief editor Olvar Kakuchaya. They slashed it: 80 percent of the news was removed. On that day Yuriy Rostov was on duty, and he considered it incumbent on him to refuse to go on the air.

[Rostov] I think the program has its image to consider. I considered it indecent to present the news in such a truncated form, and moreover truncated in a patently tendentious manner. That is why TSN had no anchorman.

[Degtyar] What specifically did they "cut"?

[Rostov] Virtually everything. Boris Yeltsin's "Direct Line" in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, reports on the strikes in the Pechora coal field, on the Kuzbass miners' meeting at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, on the clashes between police and demonstrators in Belgrade, on the victims of Stalin's repressions...

[Degtyar] Was any justification given?

[Rostov] Only the vaguest. For instance, it was planned to include in this edition a voice report on the fact that the chairamn of the All-Union Television and Radio Broadcasting Company gave an interview to the news agency IAN in which he stated that Central Television will most likely not give Boris Yeltsin air time on the eve of the referendum. After reading that, Olvar Verlamovich asked me: "Who will be interested in that?" There's no answer to that. [Rostov ends]

It is hard to say whether Olvar Verlamovich is fulfilling instructions from his leadership or acting at his own discretion.

But what lies behind the pictures is Central Television's problem. For our part, we would simply like to see normal news programs, not cheap popular programs far removed from any kind of professionalism. That's all.

Three Presidents' Powers Compared

PM1203150191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 91 Union Edition p 3

[Article by Professor B. Sobakin, member of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee: "Does the President Have a Lot of Power?"]

[Text] After the institution of the post of USSR president and the definition of his rights, in the speeches by a number of people's deputies and some of the country's political and state figures and in many periodical publications there appeared assertions that the president had been invested with virtually unlimited, truly dictatorial powers uncontrolled by anyone and with no less unlimited means to implement power which was even greater than the power of the former Russian autocrats. It is stated that the undemocratic nature of the presidential power created in our country is also confirmed by the fact that it has no analogues in civilized practice in terms of the volume of powers. At the same time the matter is depicted as though presidential power is not restrained by any counterweights, as though we had no power other than central executive power, as though the union parliament had been pushed to the edge of politics and were losing its influence on the practical solution of the questions put by life.

Here the authors of these claims do not justify them, stating that more than enough has already been said

about the subject. Indeed, more than enough has been said. But has what has been said been proven?

I think it will be useful for readers to compare all the substantial characteristics of the volume and limits of the powers of the presidents of the USSR, United States, and France and their mutual relations with the organs of legislative power. To compare them and draw conclusions.

On the basis of and in execution of the USSR Constitution the USSR president publishes decrees which are of binding force throughout the country's territory. By the 24 September 1990 law the Supreme Soviet temporarily granted the president for 18 months the right to publish decrees of an enforceable nature on a number of questions relating to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Soviet. Decrees must accord with the Constitution and the Supreme Soviet can repeal or alter any of them.

The U.S. president publishes executive decrees which are binding and is concerned that the laws be conscientiously executed. In practice Congress either directly delegates legislative powers to the president for specific questions or formulates laws in such general terms that their application requires detailing in the president's enforceable decrees.

In France Parliament can adopt laws only on those questions a list of which has been established by the constitution. The Parliament has the right to authorize the government to implement measures usually relegated to the sphere of the law. Ultimately this right is implemented by the president since only he can sign (or not sign) the relevant government act.

The USSR president must formulate by a decree the decisions of the Federation Council which he heads. In the U.S. and French systems of executive power organs there is not a hint of organs which would have the right to take decisions binding for the presidents.

The USSR president must provide the Congress of USSR People's Deputies with annual reports on the state of the nation and inform the Supreme Soviet of the most important questions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policy. The president regularly attends sittings of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, addresses them, and answers deputies' questions.

In the United States the president regularly provides Congress with information on the situation in the country and recommends that it examine measures which the president considers necessary and expedient. He attends Congress only when he reads out his messages (as a rule once a year). There is no procedure for the president to answer congressmen's questions during the sessions.

The French president does not attend legislative sessions and communicates with Parliament through messages which are not discussed. There are no obligations for the president regarding the subject matter and schedules for sending these messages.

The USSR president can return a law with his objections to the Supreme Soviet for a repeat discussion and vote. If the Supreme Soviet approves by two thirds of the votes a decision taken by it earlier, the president signs the law. A similar rule exists in the relations between the U.S. president and Congress.

The French president can also demand from Parliament a new discussion of a law it has adopted. But the demand to return the law to Parliament is considerably reduced or even disappears completely in connection with the fact that the discussion of a draft law in Parliament proceeds only according to the text submitted by the government and no amendment can be adopted for the text elaborated in the event of differences between the chambers by a joint commission if the government disagrees with the amendment.

The USSR and U.S. presidents do not have powers to dissolve the legislature. In France the president can dissolve the National Assembly. When taking this decision he is guided by his own considerations and merely consults with the prime minister and the presidents of the chambers of Parliament but these people's opinions are not binding for him.

The USSR president has under his subordination the Cabinet of Ministers which is formed by him with a consideration for the opinions of the Federation Council and by agreement with the USSR Supreme Soviet. The cabinet adopts its own resolutions and edicts independently and they can be repealed by the president and the Supreme Soviet. The Cabinet's structure is determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet at the president's suggestion. The candidate prime minister is submitted by the president and approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The president cannot relieve the prime minister of his post without the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the United States determining the cabinet's structure is the personal prerogative of the president, who is the head of government, and therefore Congress has no influence on the appointment or dismissal of the head of government (unless he is convicted of state treason, bribery, or other crimes). The French president chairs the Council of Ministers. The content of the government's decisions depends on the president as soon as he signs the orders and decrees discussed in the council of ministers, that is he lends them legal force and can also deny them legal force. The government's composition is determined by the president upon representation from the prime minister. Parliament approves or rejects the government program but not the candidacy of the prime minister.

The USSR president's appointment of the members of the Cabinet of Ministers requires the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Their dismissal must also be

agreed with the USSR Supreme Soviet. The U.S. president appoints the heads of departments with the Senate's advice and consent. But the president does not in practice agree with the Senate on the question of dismissing secretaries. The French president appoints other government members at the proposal of the prime minister and can rescind their powers. In neither case is Parliament's consent required.

The Supreme Soviet's expression of no confidence in the Cabinet entails its resignation. The president cannot prevent the cabinet's resignation. The U.S. Congress does not have the right to decide on the cabinet's resignation. In France Parliament can express no confidence in the government. In that case the premier is obliged to present the president with a statement on the government's resignation. The president either accepts the resignation or dissolves Parliament.

The USSR, U.S., and French presidents are the commanders in chief of their countries' armed forces.

In the USSR the president declares general or partial mobilization and declares martial law in individual places. Martial law throughout the country can be introduced only by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The president also declares a state of war in the event of a military attack on the USSR and immediately submits this question for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet. When it is necessary to fulfill international contract commitments the decision to declare a state of war and to use the Armed Forces is taken only by the Supreme Soviet. In the United States only Congress can declare war. But if the president is obliged to use the armed forces immediately and without preliminary agreement from Congress then he can do so, submitting a report to Congress within 48 hours on the reasons for this action. This action can continue for no more than 60 days unless Congress extends this period. In France Parliament has the right to declare war. The armed forces are managed by the government, in which the president presides. A state of siege is decreed by the Council of Ministers but the decree is signed by the president.

The USSR president has been given the right to introduce a state of emergency in individual areas at the request of or with the consent of the supreme organ of state power of the union republic. If there is no such consent, the president can nonetheless introduce a state of emergency and immediately submit his decision for approval by the USSR Supreme Soviet. For approval (that is for the retention of the emergency situation regime) two thirds of the votes of the total number of Supreme Soviet members are required. Only the USSR Supreme Soviet has the right to introduce a state of emergency throughout the country. In exceptional cases under the conditions of a state of emergency the USSR Supreme Soviet or the USSR president can bring in the military units of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR KGB.

In the event of an uprising against the government of any state the U.S. President, upon an appeal from the state authorities, can use the National Guard or regular troops to suppress the uprising. If the president believes that illegal obstacles to the functioning of state power and the execution of laws are being organized in the state, that illegal associations are being created and activated, or that rebellions are erupting, he can make independent use of the National Guard and regular troops to restore order without a request from the state authorities. The president has the right to use armed forces if the authorities cannot ensure the fulfillment of U.S. laws by conventional means. The president's decision to use his military powers inside the country is not subject to legal review.

When the institutions of the French Republic, the nation's independence, the integrity of its territory, or the fulfillment of its international commitments are seriously and directly jeopardized and the normal functioning of the constitutional state authorities has been broken off, the president takes the steps dictated by these circumstances. There is no provision for the need for these measures to be authorized or approved by anyone whomsoever. The president only has to consult on the subject with the prime minister, the presidents of the chambers, and the constitutional council, whose opinion is not binding for him. The volume of the measures taken by the president is unlimited and enables him in fact to replace both government and parliament.

Presidential rule can be introduced by the USSR president as a temporary measure in places where an emergency situation has already been declared within the procedure described above and on condition that in these places the organs of state power and administration are failing to ensure the proper implementation of their functions. Presidential rule is introduced while observing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the union republic.

The USSR president can be removed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies if he violates the USSR Constitution and laws. The question of removal can be raised at the initiative of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or the USSR Supreme Soviet. The decision to remove him is taken by no less than two thirds of the votes of the total number of deputies. In the United States the president can be removed from his post after conviction for state treason, bribery, or other crimes. The proceedings to remove the president are instituted by the House of Representatives and are examined by the Senate. He cannot be impeached without the agreement of two thirds of the senators present. The French president bears no responsibility for actions carried out by him during the execution of his duties except for cases of state treason. A charge can be brought only by identical decisions by the chambers of parliament. The president is tried by the Supreme Chamber of Justice.

I think that this factual information will enable each person to answer the question of whether there serious

powers which the Soviet president could exercise without the permission or control of many state organs, guided only by his own completely unrestricted discretion. Of course, this information confirms that the size of the powers of the president of the Soviet Union and his relations with other organs of the state are indeed diverging from existing analogues. But it also shows where this divergence is going.

Cabinet Asks Country To Collect Scrap Metal

PM0603123091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

["USSR Cabinet of Ministers Appeal to the Governments of Union and Autonomous Republics, Labor Collectives, and Citizens of the Country"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

An extremely grave situation has arisen recently in the metallurgical industry. Coke batteries, furnaces, and steel smelting units are at a standstill or are operating below capacity, some of them are prone to malfunctions, and the national economy is receiving less and less nonferrous and ferrous metals, rolled metal products, and pipes. Doubtless there is no need to explain that without metal there will be neither oil nor gas, power nor heat, machines nor bread. There will be no work for labor collectives in virtually all sectors of the national economy.

This situation has arisen largely because of last year's miners' strikes, when the metalworkers failed to receive the necessary quantity of coking coal from them. The metalworkers, aware of their responsibility to the country, partly made up for this shortfall by reducing their running stocks and increasing the use of scrap metal in steel smelting. But today deliveries of coking coal have not yet reached the necessary level. Meanwhile scrap metal procurement has declined. This has brought the metalworkers to the brink of stoppage. As a result in the first two months of this year we were unable to smelt 1.5 million tonnes of urgently needed steel or to supply the national economy with more than a million tonnes of rolled metal products and a large quantity of nonferrous metals. The situation could frankly be said to have become critical.

The government is adopting the necessary measures: Exports of coking coal and scrap metal have been halted, and prices increased by an average of 60 percent. Other economic measures are planned to boost the collection and utilization of scrap metal. But all this must be backed up by a drastic improvement in the organization of the collection and delivery of scrap. There is scrap metal in the country. Unutilized scrap resources alone in the national economy are estimated at more than 10 million tonnes, and they could fully ensure uninterrupted work by the metallurgical industry and provide metal for the production of machines and consumer goods and for the construction industry.

The USSR Ministry of Metallurgy has now launched major work to organize small enterprises both in the main metallurgical production sphere and within the structure of the "Soyuzvtormet" concern. The creation of such enterprises to collect scrap metal is economically advantageous. We recommend that associations and enterprises of all ministries and departments adopt measures to organize small enterprises for the collection and procurement of scrap ferrous and nonferrous metals—that very valuable raw material—in order to meet the requirements of the metallurgical industry and the entire national economy.

The Cabinet of Ministers appeals to the governments of union and autonomous republics, soviets of people's deputies and their executive bodies, leaders of industrial, construction, and transport enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, cooperatives, and institutions, their labor collectives, parties and social movements, and all citizens to embark in the most energetic manner on organizing the collection of scrap ferrous and nonferrous metals everywhere. This will be an important contribution to stabilizing our economy and filling the consumer market with goods.

[Signed] The USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

Economic

Kuzbass Hunger Strikers Demand Gorbachev Resign

LD1303163191 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Four representatives of the Kuzbass mining community and Russian MP Bella Denisenko began a hunger strike in Moscow today to demand the resignation of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

They also demand dissolution of the national parliament, depolitisation of the army, the KGB and the Interior Ministry and the transfer of several central mass media bodies to the Russian Republic's control.

The announcement was made at a news conference in the Moscow City Council today by Anatoliy Malykhin, member of the council of Kuzbass Workers' Committees. He arrived in the capital on March 10 with a delegation of miners who wanted to meet the president to tell him of their demands.

The miners were received by Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Gorbachev refused to meet the miners, Malykhin said. According to him, the hunger strikers intend to continue their protest until "demands of the Kuzbass miners are satisfied."

Other speakers at the news conference, representing the coordinating council of the Democratic Russia movement, expressed their support for the miners' demands.

According to Yuriy Afanasyev, one of the movement's leaders and member of the national parliament, Democratic Russia intends to collect food parcels and raise money for the striking workers in the Kuznetsk coal basin.

Gorbachev Given 1 April Deadline

LD1303170991 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo, Western Siberia March 13 TASS—The Kemerovo Regional Council of People's Deputies today discussed the situation in the Kuznetsk coal basin and the country as a whole following miners' decision to declare a general political strike.

Nine out of the region's 101 collieries were on strike today. Employees of others are holding rallies and sessions of workers' committees to decide whether to support the strikers.

The majority of deputies voted in favour of sending a delegation to see President Mikhail Gorbachev. They believe that Gorbachev should personally consider the miners' main political demands before April 1.

The Council voted to suspend the strike during talks with the president and request mineworkers not to reduce coal production.

22 Mines on Strike in Kuzbass

LD1403093891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0800 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] This morning the situation at the underground coal- producing enteprises remained unstable, TASS reports. The miners of the Bolshevik, Pervomayska, Biryulinskaya, Krasnyy Kuzbass continued the strike, although 500 tonnes of coal were extracted at the latter yesterday. Repair teams went down the pit-face at four mines in Kisilevsk and at one mine in Novokuznetsk—yesterday their collectives took part in the strike. Since the strike started, the Bolshevik's debt has approached 25,000 tonnes. The stoppage at the Biryulinskaya mine causes serious concern of specialists. After a fire, its underground structures were put in order by joint efforts. Many enterprises and associations of the Severokuzbassugol helped: They allocated 10 million rubles hoping that the mine would produce a lot of coal in a short while. Therefore, colleagues regard today's action by the miners of Biryulinskaya as unfriendly.

Now the situation has deteriorated. Twenty-two mines and two mine-producing enterprises have stopped work. We will recall that there are more than 100 mine-producing enterprises in Kuzbass altogether and only nine were on strike yesterday. Apart from Novokuznetsk, Kisilevsk, and Berezovskiy, mines in Kemerovo, Mezhdurechensk, Leninsk, Kuznetsk, and Prokopyevsk have gone on strike. It seems that the appeal of a majority of deputies of the oblast soviet not to decrease coal extraction and to send a delegation to the USSR president to examine the demands put forward by the miners has failed to win the miners's support. At the same time, the collectives of Kuzbass opencast collieries have not stopped for a moment yet. From the beginning of this year they have produced about 400,000 tonnes of fuel in addition to the state order, thereby partly compensating for the unsteady work of certain mines.

Coalfield Joins Strike

LD1303235491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2137 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent V. Lyashko, from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Miners of the Lvov-Volhynia coalfield today proclaimed an indefinite strike. This morning extracting and shipping coal was halted at 21 mines.

The strikers are demanding that their earnings be increased two- fold or 2.5-fold. In addition they have put forward a number of political demands, including the resignation of the USSR president and the dissolution of the country's Supreme Soviet.

The strike that has now begun will complicate the already difficult situation in respect to energy supplies in the Western region of the Ukraine.

Area Strike Update

LD1303164191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] In the mines of Donetsk oblast, the appeal of a number of strike committees to extend the strike did not receive support. In Vorkuta all the enterprises of Intaugol also worked normally. The striking collective of the Podmoskovnaya mine was joined today by the miners of the Zapadnaya and Mostovskaya mines.

Miners Union Leader Calls Strikers 'Enemies'

LD1303135891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] As distinct from the country's highest leadership, the state trade union of coal miners reacted to the miners' action with speed. Vladimir Lunev, chairman of the official trade union of the country's coal miners, stated in an interview given to a Postfaktum agency correspondent: All those who organize these strikes are enemies of the working people, because the strikes have not been prepared, are illegal, and push coal miners' collectives into complete economic collapse. The strike organizers are political adventurers. They pursue just one goal: To split the unified workers' movement and sow dissent between the leaders and participants in the workers' committees and the official trade union.

Muscovites Show Symbolic Support

LD1403113191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 14 Mar 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In the last few hours, the miners' strike has gathered momentum. Estimates of the numbers of striking coal mines vary: the figure of 60 coal mines as a whole in the country is being mentioned more often than others. Recently strikes have even spread to the Podmoskovnyy coal basin. Estimates of losses caused by the strike vary and contradict one another to some extent. Prime Minister Pavlov has stated, for instance, that the country has at least two months' coal reserves. At the same time reports have been coming in from various regions in the last few hours—this is what TASS reports—to the effect that a whole number of enterprises are now on the verge of having to stop operations.

Miners of the Lvovsko-Volynskiy coal basin have declared an indefinite strike. The extraction and dispatch of coal was stopped in the morning at 21 coal mines. The strikers demand that their wages be increased 2-2.5 times. In addition, they have submitted a number of political demands, including one for the USSR president's resignation and for the country's Supreme Soviet dissolution. The strike that has begun will complicate the situation concerning power supplies to the western Ukraine, a situation that is already difficult enough as it is.

A collection of food aid to the striking Kubass miners is underway in Moscow, in Prospekt Mira at the Olimpiyskiy sports complex. As we left to take this film we tried to guess from where the food will come in our half-starved Moscow and who will bring it. Everything proved to be so simple as to be elementary: rationed goods, sugar, groats, flour, canned foods, and even children's food—everything came from what has been accumulated at home for a rainy day. Maybe it came from the last reserves. Strange that we are still capable of sharing in someone else's woes. Be that as it may, this trailer, full of food, will hardly improve the situation in Kuzbass. It is just the people who have come here expressing their own attitude at their own human level toward those who are on strike.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified man] Theirs are correct political demands and we will give them everything we have. I am an old age pensioner but I brought here what I had: sugar, mushrooms that I had collected and dried. I will, pardon me, give them to the miners.

[Another man] We are ready to be cold and hungry but we will help them. [end recording]

The collection of aid is still continuing.

Regional Economic Links Not Succeeding

914A0509A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Reports by IZVESTIYA correspondents O. Stefashin, I. Litvinova, and E. KONDRATOV, and an editorial commentary by I. Zhagel: "Signed Contracts, No Deliveries"]

[Text] **The gravity of the problem of links between enterprises in different regions, which has been discussed in the recent USSR Cabinet of Ministers meeting, is being confirmed by reports from IZVESTIYA staff correspondents.**

KARAGANDA:

The situation in many Karaganda enterprises is very alarming: Sharp reductions in contractual deliveries may lead to stoppages on huge enterprises that manufacture polymers, industrial rubber items, heating equipment, and complexes for underground coal extraction. Many people had hoped that agreements between Kazakhstan and four other sovereign republics, even though they may not result in the quick emergence of a new mechanism of domestic market relations, at the very least would help to restore broken interregional links. Unfortunately, this has not happened. As I was told in the Karaganda Main Supply Administration, it is mostly those republics that had already signed government agreements that owe deliveries to Karaganda enterprises. How should we interpret all this? Here is the opinion of N. Sytin, deputy director of the heating equipment factory:

"These agreements have no practical value for the producers. Just try to refer to them when negotiating with a partner. In reply, he will pour on you anything but the raw materials he is supposed to deliver. Contracts lack the main ingredient—a legal enforcement mechanism."

RIGA:

Government leaders of Latvia, Russia, Belorussia, and Ukraine unanimously agreed during their negotiations to preserve normal economic links. Unfortunately, practice deviates from the plans agreed upon. Alvis-Harius Kramins, deputy director of the trade policy department, says:

"The economic agreement between Latvia and Russia was signed by Council of Ministers Chairmen Silayev and Godmanis on 14 September. It contained basic principles of economic relations. However, it did not specify concrete mutual deliveries. The only stipulation was that at least the 1990 levels would be maintained. However, there is already a danger that the delivery levels of last year will not be reached. One example: We only received about 60 percent of last year's volume of polymer materials deliveries. The agreement signed between the Russian State Committee for Technical and Material Supply and the Latvian Ministry for Material

Resources probably contains more political statements and words about cooperation than actual figures. For instance, we still do not know the volume of petroproduct deliveries to Latvia. The same goes for coal, timber, chemicals, and many other materials."

KISHINEV:

"The intergovernment agreement between Ukraine and Moldova, signed on 11 January, offered hope for certain progress in balancing mutual deliveries between the two republics," said V. Parfenov, Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] first deputy minister of material resources. "By now, we have generally resolved the issues related to deliveries of metal products to Moldova, and we have reached an agreement on a significant increase in deliveries of products of the machine-building industry. The Moldova Ministry of Trade and its Ukrainian counterpart have agreed on the volumes of nonfood goods deliveries. The situation is not as good in regard to contracts on raw foodstuffs, solid fuels, and petro-products, and this creates difficulties for our enterprises."

"What specifically has this agreement produced for Moldovan enterprises? How can we measure the benefit of the republics' horizontal agreements?"

"I think it is too early to talk about it. I do not have any figures or other data—it is all, as they say, in the works."

OUR COMMENTARY: As far back as last December, well known scientist and journalist N. Shchmelev said in his interview to IZVESTIYA (No 350) that he doubted that the interrepublic agreements were creating a qualitatively new situation in industry and agriculture and would help to improve the work of the workers collectives. Rather, the current mutual acknowledgement of economic sovereignties moves the administrative system from the Union to the republic level, which makes things even worse for the actual producers.

What other outcome could it bring if ministries of one republic start taking charge of the raw materials deliveries, another republic is in charge of fuel and energy resources, the third supplies the components, and the assembly takes place under control of the fourth republic's government. Add to this numerous bans on the export of production, passed at the level of parliaments and local Soviets.

Reports from IZVESTIYA correspondents from various regions confirm that administrative decentralization in its current form actually made the enterprises' work more complicated. It did nothing to prevent widespread breakdown of old, well-established ties. Preferential treatment regimes for mutual economic activities stipulated in interrepublic agreements help about as much as the airwaves produced by drum beat.

Of course, we do not advocate a return to the past. We do believe that the old administrative-command system should only be rejected in proportion to the progress in creating new market structures. Right now the republic governments' task is specifically to assist in creating such structures.

The important thing is to free the producers from the domination of both big and "medium" administrators and give them greater economic independence and an opportunity to operate on any territory. However, it is unlikely that this will happen before certain conditions are ripe. Do economic declarations designed for making an impression help this? Hardly. What is needed is laborious work aimed not at the isolation of the territories but at the creation of conditions for economic freedom for each enterprise and individual.

Trade Union Sends Letter to Leadership

914F0163A Moscow TRUD in Russian 12 Mar 91 p 1

[Report on letter from USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions to USSR President Gorbachev and governing bodies on the pension law: "Letter from the Trade Unions to the President"]

[Text]**The Presidium of the Council of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions decided to send a letter to M.S. Gorbachev, the USSR Council of the Federation, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviets and governments of the Union republics, and the republic trade unions associations on the subject of correlation between the Union and republics laws on pensions.**

The letter says that the Union law in question means a fundamental reform of the pension system. At the same time, the letter underscores, considering the new approach toward budget formation, pensions stipulated on the Union level should be regarded as a minimum guarantee for all citizens. The republics, depending on their resources, may—and should—establish other, higher pensions.

However, says the letter, processes taking place in some regions seriously complicate implementation of the pension reform. The greatest difficulties arise concerning the law "On State Pensions in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]." By adopting this law, the Russian parliament decided not to put the all-Union legislation into effect on their territory.

At the same time, the RSFSR pension law substantially alters the principles of the Union law, and excludes the possibility of linking it with the social security provisions of other republics. Having improved the situation for some groups of pensioners, the Russian document violated the rights of a large number of people, and eliminates all-state social guarantees, which is a matter of special concern. Putting the cap on pensions encroaches on the rights of those who work better, or work in hardship conditions, in the North, or possess higher skills.

The RSFSR law also has other provisions that, compared with the Union document, make the veterans' situation

worse. The issue in question is preferential pension provisions for rural workers, especially women, fishermen, railway workers, and sailors. Also missing are special conditions to lower the retirement age for miners who do not have the necessary length of service working underground.

Unfortunately, the letter says, some other republics are also working on laws that undermine the foundations of the Union pension system and limit citizens' rights. For instance, the pension laws in Latvia and Moldova stipulate that in order to qualify for a pension two thirds of the total length of service must involve working on the territory of the republic. Some republics have adopted resolutions to stop transferring social security money into all- Union funds. This approach threatens the entire pension reform.

The Presidium of the Council of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions believes that all of this contradicts the USSR Constitution and USSR laws, and deprives thousands and thousands of working people of social protection. This includes those who have had to leave their places of permanent residence because of the rise in ethnic tensions, or for other reasons. Neither should one forget that market relations are not possible without a single labor market, which means the existence of a countrywide pension system.

The Presidium of the Council of the USSR General Confederation of the Trade Unions proposes that the current situation be given immediate consideration and that steps be taken toward ensuring stability in the material provisions for pensioners. It is necessary, the letter underscores, to achieve a conceptual unity of Union and republics laws on the basis of the general principles of protecting those unable to work.

Agricultural

Pavlov Visits Agro-Industrial Complex

LD1403001591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Report by correspodent G. Sedov, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Anticipating tomorrow's conference on problems concerning spring sowing, Prime Minister Pavlov spent almost all today at the Ramenskoye agro-industrial complex near Moscow. Correspondent G. Sedov reports:

[Sedov] The farm is enormous. It consists of 53 enterprises and 20,000 employees. Its basic funds amount to over r550 million. It has the widest range of produce: Cereals, Potatoes, vegetables, livestock raising, processing enterprises, and so on and so forth. In the prime minister's tight schedule, it was hard to find a moment for conversation with him.

[Begin Recording] [Pavlov] In ancient times, during the sowing period, even wars used to stop, and we have agreed that a country that doesn't sow is a country of the doomed. So, no matter how many meetings we hold, no matter how much we abuse one another, we are all obliged to sow.

[Sedov] You reap what you sow.

[Pavlov] Yes.

[Sedov] Valentin Sergeyvich, as prime minister you probably have information about how things will be as regards the sowing period in general in our country.

[Pavlov] You know, there are several specialized questions. Specifically, what has been confirmed here today. We knew that matters as regards sheets...

[Unidentified man, interrupting] Polythene sheet.

[Pavlov] ...were poor, for the greenhouses, and so we've already discussed that question, and I had somewhere a certain, to be honest, doubt about whether we were adopting the right decision, because we adopted a decision, since time was pressing, to remove some of the sheets from the market stocks and hand them over for vegetable-growing farms. We'll return them at about the second or third quarter for individual, private farms, private plots, cottage plots, and so on.

[Sedov] But here, in Ramenskoye, I even heard folk saying that the summer promises to be a good one. Will it not turn out, in your opinion, the way it was with the last harvest—an unprecedented harvest, but one not fully gathered in and also poorly stored?

[Pavlov] You know, the lessons of last year are, I would say, very harsh, because last year, under the influence of, I would say, all kinds of inadequate slogans and appeals, we—townsfolk—decided, in many cases, that it was not our business to help with gathering in the harvest, and that it should be done by those who, in general, as it were, are, as they say, paid to do it. When everyone sits at the table to eat, no one sorts out who is working voluntarily and who is obliged to. It's all the same. So everyone has to work in that case. We adopted such a decision, but it is important that they should be implemented, because they really are not just for someone, not for some mystical center, or for...

[unidentified man, interrupting] for everyone.

[Pavlov] ...But simply for all people.

Kazakhstan Able to Sell Other Republics Grain

LD1203143191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0900 GMT 12 Mar 91

[Summary] Kazakhstan dispatches daily 30,000 tonnes of grain all over the country. Last year's heavy harvest—especially of strong and hard wheat—is enabling it to sell 7 million tonnes outside the republic. Agreements have been signed with Russia, Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Azerbaijan, and Tajikistan, and so far 4 million tonnes have been dispatched to them. Although

no agreements have been reached with them, Kazakh grain is also being sent to the Baltic republics, Georgia, Armenia and Moldova.

Polozkov on Agricultural Difficulties

914B0115A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 6 Mar 91 p 2

[Interview with Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, by SELSKAYA ZHIZN Correspondent Z. Milman, Krasnoyarsk Kray: "The Truth of Difficult Questions: Interview with CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member and RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary I.K. Polozkov"]

[Text] As we have already reported, the results of the January (1991) combined CPSU TsKK [Central Control Commission] and Central Committee Plenum were discussed and the sociopolitical situation in the country and variations to stabilize the socioeconomic situation in Russia during the transition period to a market economy were reviewed at an RSFSR CP East Siberia Gorkom and Raykom Secretary Zonal Study Group-Panel in Krasnoyarsk. CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member and RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary I. Polozkov participated in the meeting's work and other comrades visited kray center workers collective. Meetings with residents of Shushenskiy Oblast, Khakasskiy Autonomous Oblast, and Transpolar Norilsk also took place.

[Milman] Ivan Kuzmich, when the troyka passed by you on the narrow street in Memorial Village in Shumenskiy Oblast and a pretentiously straining woman with wooden buckets flew by you, when young boys in men's blouses and girls in embroidered Russian peasant women's dresses met you in one of the museum huts and began to sing a dashing folk song accompanied by an accordion, much as I regret it, I thought: Is it possible that the times of pretense are here again? And I did not offend the residents of Shushenskiy Oblast for any reason at all in my thoughts. Larisa Shepeleva, lecturer and organizer of "V.I. Lenin's Siberian Exile" Museum-Preserve, that same woman with the yoke [for carrying buckets], said that the people's cottage industries have been revitalized and that village festive gatherings are now becoming a part of museum life with a lively, integral background.

[Polozkov] It is splendid that the Lenin Museum has found this second life. It is as if a village of the end of the last century is actually coming alive before our very eyes. And here you cannot embellish anything. The people themselves always distinguish what is false from what is real.

[Milman] You also advised the museum workers: "You do not need to protect Ilich, talk using the language of the document and the language of truth." But if this truth diverges from that truth, what have we learned? Here one Angarsk peasant-nirzhak [not found] somehow asks me: "All of my life I have revered God and respected Lenin. All my life I thought that both God and Lenin bring good to man. Suddenly I read in the newspaper that he, Vladimir Ilich, allegedly personally urged the annihilation of priests. Was this true?"

[Polozkov] You know world outlook issues—materialism and atheism—are one thing. Although, of course, we have gone much too far in our violent denial of religion. The categorical nature and the orthodoxy—there was all of this and it yielded much misfortune. But did the deification of Ilich himself not actually harm the image of this great man? Christian values and those common to all mankind are another matter. They are compatible. There are opportunities for cooperation here. As for the annihilation of clergymen... I do not know if Lenin assigned that task. A class struggle and a civil war were occurring and he could hardly have "singled out" clergymen. But we should not be afraid of difficult questions. Life raises them at every step. And Lenin had to answer the most difficult questions and during a troubled and tragic time! He searched, tormented himself, and made mistakes. And even today faith in the ideals which he proclaimed are a source of hope and strength for millions of people throughout the entire world.

[Milman] In Shushenskiy Oblast, you had a very interesting time with a basket weaving master. I admit I thought that you were beginning to sing his praises when you said that the young people will never let the handicrafts die. And you began rebuking from out of nowhere: You are trimming the twigs for no purpose and the bottom is unreliable.... Did you specially study this field?

[Polozkov] I was raised in the country and it taught everyone—how to work as a carpenter, to mow, to make silage, and how to feed and milk cows.

[Milman] Has it been a long time since you last milked a cow?

[Polozkov] Not long ago. And do you know where? In Austria. I was working as Krasnoyarsk Kray First Secretary, I went on a trip, and I was invited to visit a farmer and his workers. We worked together for several days. I observed their lifestyle firsthand, who they cooperated with, and what the labor costs were.

[Milman] What was your impression?

[Polozkov] It was depressing! They work very hard and they do not have much. They get up at 4:30 a.m. and they go to bed at 10:30 p.m. And they do not have any days off nor do they have time to be sick. It is true that he had a new Mercedes but he could not remember when he had last been in Vienna (it is 106 kilometers away). And it had been a year since he had visited Linz, the oblast center. He had 12 hectares of corn, eight hectares of alfalfa, three hectares each of cereals, and rape, 100 head of long horn cattle—he had to handle all of that! Furthermore, he had two tractors, two trucks, a suite of farm

machinery, a modern farm, guaranteed services from the local chemical and technical stations, and a hard-surfaced road that led from the autobahn.

[Milman] Does it seem that we should let our own novice farmers especially envy your Austrian acquaintance? But each month there are more and more people who would like to farm land independently. And Oleg Shalyukov, a young farmer from Bogotolskiy Rayon, was looking for you at the meeting with Krasnoyarsk Combine Builders and bombarded you with questions and requests. And you told him: "Stick by the kolkhoz and you will be the richest farmer in Russia"....

[Polozkov] If he took 100 hectares of land and if he competently and quite seriously told me that he also wants to have areas sowed with fodder and grain or tilled, he will not get by without small equipment. Why does he need a "Don" or "Sibiryak"? Why does he need a six- or twelve-bottom plow that is designed to be used with a "Kirovets"? But you are correct that no one manufactures a two-bottom plow in our country. And you will not find a small harrow. But tell me when our Oleg Nikolayevich Shalyukov, without a horse of his own, will be able to build himself a gas pump if he remains aloof from everyone else? And who will give him phosphorous or nitrogen fertilizers to feed his clover and winter crops? And cattle need their inoculations—where will he run to? Yes he will perish without the kolkhoz! And I do not agree with the television commentator who shows the farmer and his wife who are living in poverty with shovels and pitchforks and moreover who criticize the kolkhoz chairman—he is this and that and he does not want to help. But why must he help those who left the kolkhoz and who do not want to enter into any economic ties with it whatsoever?

[Milman] Why must the chairman help an individual peasant who has become the kolkhoz's competitor—Is that what you want to say?

[Polozkov] I want to say that there are no grounds to submit complaints to this chairman. Excuse me! This is at the very least untenable. Kolkhoz workers accuse that same chairman: They say, the farmer gave him a bribe. But who will believe otherwise that he helps him "for such"?

This view of farming when a peasant maintains contract ties, especially long-term ties, with a kolkhoz or sovkhoz impresses me. Or when peasants lease land and other production assets from the kolkhoz or sovkhoz.

Two brothers, a driver and a mechanic, and their wives—a milkmaid and a calf-tender (one of them, Valentina Dmitriyevna Popova, was a Russian Supreme Soviet deputy at that time) at Krasnodar Kray's Beloglinskiy Rayon's "17th Party Congress" Farm, were the first in the kray to take an old farm and then repaired a tractor and an old small cart at the kolkhoz's expense that they then leased from the kolkhoz and they built a leisure nook with a sauna and a samovar and they selected 139 cows and non-calving young cows. They pour the milk into a common cauldron and at the sales price like the others and they purchase feed at the kolkhoz at the same cost. But they had already received an additional 1,000 liters per head per milking year in the first year due to numerous feedings, heated facilities, and an economic attitude toward the business. Right now I think that they are producing more than 5,000 liters of milk. And they are earning three times as much. At first, this did not suit everyone. I recall that I was then kraysoviet chairman and Valentina Popova came to see me with a request: "Ivan Kuzmich, help me to buy a Volga. I will learn for fun by driving through the village." I told her: "Wait a while, why are you so aggressive?" And she answered, "Do you know how much we have endured? They call us Kulaks!"

I had to protect the honor of hard-working people with initiative. We sold them a Volga out of turn. I was in Krasnodar not long ago and I ran into her—she has learned, she drives! Such people break through all the barriers and overcome any sort of talk. To this cooperative that is linked with the kolkhoz—live and develop! It did not leave the village—the infrastructure has been rebuilt with two schools, kindergartens, a swimming pool, and a stadium. And if you are raising onions or roses—nevertheless you have a direct reason to stay in touch with kolkhozes and sovkhozes and to conduct communal farming. And in my opinion the kolkhozes and sovkhozes themselves must be transformed into associations of farmers and associations of cooperatives where each person knows that it belongs to him personally. Not only in the direct sense of, say, a tractor or a cow, but indirectly [oposredovanno], let us assume, through specialist knowledge. Popova employs a livestock expert and a veterinarian but she refused to hire an electrician. Why does she need an electrician if there are two mechanics in the two families? These farmers will soon sort out what they need to specialize in and they will conclude contracts among themselves. The kolkhoz's mission will be reduced to what the great Agrarian A.V. Chayanov wrote about: To the purchase of equipment and to the creation of equipment sales societies, stud unions, land reclamation cooperatives, and daily life infrastructure development.... So that the revival of society's true owner is not a hindrance but, on the contrary, a help.

[Milman] And how do you regard the developments of the Russian Association of Peasant Farms?

[Polozkov] I bet this type of separated farm [khutorskoye khozyaystvo], as they suggest, will not exist in 15 years. I know Bashmachnikov, the chairman of this association. In my opinion, his head is in the clouds.... And we have developed real models in Kuban.

And 360 poorly developed farms, as a rule, have already essentially been transformed into an association of cooperatives—strong and profitable. Let us take Pavlovskiy Rayon's "Za mir i trud" Kolkhoz. All of the vehicles in its garage are on a 15-year lease. The drivers hired themselves a dispatcher and they work strictly according

to requests. The time has come. They found an old pigsty far from the village and they contracted with the chairman—they renovated the building, they automated it, and they put 500 pigs there. They drive over to it in the morning and evening when they get off work and feed the pigs. And both they and the kolkhoz benefit. One driver gave me an autographed five-ruble note and said: "Believe me, I have more than you do!" They have also begun making summer bath-houses and garage doors from scrap metal and wicker. By the way, they have manufactured 240,000 rubles worth of these unique consumer goods. This is what I call managers!

And you know this process is occurring everywhere. They are building two and three store houses and they are already not calling each other Kulak. And if someone envies someone, it is only in the sense that I have a green car and you have a red one.

[Milman] But what should the land actually be—-"mine" or "ours"?

[Polozkov] Today we have come full circle on this problem. Furthermore, American farmers recently arrived in the Soviet Union and the said that is not the problem, the problem is that 65 percent of the land in our country is in the hands of those who do not work on it. This is bad. We have decided to buy up land and later to sell it to farmers. They think that the main thing is **are you the owner of a cultivated product**!

The fundamental position of Russian communists is: We are against buying and selling land that has been given to us by nature and, therefore, which belongs to everyone. Land is really not just an arable layer. It is also the depths of the earth and ecology. And let us be honest: Well, is a simple man really capable of buying land? Just who is planning to buy it? The one who least of all thinks about how to feed you and me. He wants to invest his capital! And later sell this same small piece of land! And what does it mean to divide the land in Kuban, in Stavropol, and in Northern Ossetia? This is blood! A resort zone?

Professor and Landowner A.N. Engelhardt, a major expert of pre-revolutionary peasantry, while noting the need and importance of artel farming in the village, wrote in his "Pisma iz derevni" [Letters from the Village]: "...The division of the land into small plots for private use, the accommodation of individual farmers on these plots who live in their own huts, and who each work their own plots alone is senseless in an agricultural sense.... Farming can truly progress only when," he stressed, "the land is in common use and is cultivated by everyone together... Everyone who loves Russia and for whom its development, power, strength is precious must work in this direction." How timely this scholar's thoughts are and how practical they are to this very day! For how many years are we once again undertaking the immoral and dangerous parceling out? Land must be given to the people for eternal use with the right to settle it. And that is all! Live and prosper! And if a nephew or grandson wants to refuse it—let the state compensate him for all expenses.

[Milman] Ivan Kuzmich, we have proposed on more than one occasion that the working man prosper and then we gathered everything up. Since the state has found it necessary to devote great efforts so that this same peasant believes in the irreversibility of the changes. For now where is the most timely development of the mechanisms of social protection.

[Polozkov] First of all, I will once again stress: We need to be concerned about existing facilities—about kolkhozes and sovkhozes. **They** feed us today. If we cast them aside the way the Russian Government did, we will perish. Really the billion rubles that has been allocated for farm development, is a political act and nothing more. I would like to believe that all of it will go the farmers. But how many farms will be created on it if the infrastructure for one costs half a million? They have diverted us, they have diverted us through their loud declarations. The total amount of livestock has dropped as a result of the short-sighted state policy throughout Russia. And as before, no one is worried about the fate of sovkhozes which first of all will go bankrupt under market conditions. What will we attain? Well, let us assume that the people who work on them will manage to somehow retrain, but what about the fields, will we let weeds grow in them? There will be a blow throughout the sector!

The way out? We are not asking anyone for subsidies—everyone has been transformed around into suppliants. One thing remains—to increase purchase prices. To simultaneously cease dictating from above **what** and **how much** a peasant must hand over. If it is profitable to let him keep 20-30 percent at his place—let him keep it. He must be able to acquire something, if only elementary manufactured goods, for it!

With time the market will lower price levels and will result in a rational cost equivalent of industrial and agricultural production. But right now you are correct that there is no more important task than the protection of people from the spontaneous decline in the standard of living. We intend to aggressively conduct our policy through communist factions in Soviets, partkoms, leading party organizations, through the Party press, including the new publication for the Russian village—TsK KP RSFSR KRESTYANSKIY SOYUZ [RSFSR CP Central Committee and Peasant Union] newspaper—which we are already planning to publish next month as a supplement to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. We firmly advocate that the Law on Social Guarantees must be the first document in the overall package of market codes of law.

[Milman] It will be hardest of all for the so-called non-production sphere, teachers, doctors, club employees, and librarians—they also "attempt to be the holy spirit" in the village but what about tomorrow?

[Polozkov] Local Soviets are obligated to place this burden on their own shoulders and honestly and frankly say: Since we are entering another line, additional items of expenditure for social protection of this category of people, in the oblast, rayon, village or rural budget. If the need arises, we need to increase the collected tax percentage from enterprises. I am sure: No matter what political orientation they adhere to—this decision will not meet with any objections from the deputies.

[Milman] My colleagues and I have noted: The most prevalent question during your meetings with Party activists was—relations with B. Yeltsin. The authors of many comments did not hide their categorical nature. "Why do you not organize public opinion against him?"

[Polozkov] If you recall, my answers were reduced to the fact that we need to divide fundamental disputes and constructive and even harsh criticism of our opponent's positions and headlong discredit of a man's personality that are mixed into a search for different sorts of compromises. Common sense is indispensable, especially in politics. And now they have stopped acting against me as they did previously. They have understood: Artificially planting a negative image will produce nothing besides the opposite result.

[Milman] But do the leader of the Russian Parliament and the leader of Russia's communists have concurring points of view?

[Polozkov] Soon after the 2nd Republic Congress of People's Deputies I read (perhaps in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA) about the results of one sociological study. It turned out that during roll-call votes on the 10 most fundamental factors, both Yeltsin, Khasbulatov, and Polozkov thought identically. Our names ended up in the same column (out of nine) in the so-called left center.

[Milman] Today, both in the city and in the village, no matter whom you talk to everything is essentially about the same thing, pray to God that all of us, who are so different, will quickly put an end to discord and will quickly find that which can unite us.

[Polozkov] You agree it will not be easy to unite with those who are struggling against this unity. But I am convinced: We will not save the Fatherland by ourselves. Only together!

Early March Weather, Crop Conditions

914B0114A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Mar 91 p 2

[Article by A. Grishina, agricultural meteorologist: "The Weather and Crops"]

[Text] By the beginning of March there was almost no snow on the fields with winter grain crops in Moldova and in the southern and central oblasts of the Ukraine. Over the majority of the Northern Caucasus region, in the Kalmyk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], and in southern Astrakhan Oblast the earth was still frozen and the winter grain crops were in a state of winter dormancy. The minimum soil temperature at the depth where the tillering node of the winter grain crops is bedded in these regions stayed within the range of minus three to five degrees.

Over the majority of the territory of the Transcaucasian republics the average air temperature for the 10-day period was close to the annual average, and in southern Armenia and eastern Georgia it was two to three degrees above the average. In several regions of Azerbaijan the vegetation of the winter grain crops began to renew itself, and the buds of apricots and cherry-plums were observed to be swelling.

In the republics of Central Asia the average air temperature for the 10-day period was close to the annual average. Lower temperatures were observed at the middle of the 10-day period (the minimum air temperature was minus six to minus 12 degrees). In the daytime the air warmed to a temperature of 13 to 20 degrees, and in the southern oblasts it reached 20 to 23 degrees. In southern Turkmenia, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan the vegetation of the winter grain crops began to renew itself.

Scientific

Tyumen Officials Warn of Impending Energy Crisis

LD1303133991 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Prutkin]

[Text] Tyumen March 13 TASS—Local lawmakers in Tyumen region issued an appeal to President Mikhail Gorbachev and regional leaders today, warning them of a looming energy crisis.

"Within a year or two we will have to buy oil abroad," Yu. Vershinin, chairman of the Tyumenneftegaz Association, forecasts.

More than 40 million tonnes of fuel has already been lost due to reduced financing, shortages of resources and arguments over prices. The Tyumenneftegaz Association will fall 17-18 million tonnes of fuel short of the state order this year, Vershinin said. Thousands of gas workers could be left without work. "Our powerful sector is on the brink of collapse," he said.

Fuel production has been falling for the second year running, leading to greater social and political tensions in the region.

Consumers of Tyumen oil and gas often refuse to deliver much- needed resources and food in return.

Union and republican governments have failed to ease the situation in Tyumen region.

"Listening to their reason, oil and gas workers have so far refrained from ultimatums, they simply make another warning about possible consequences," Vershinin said.

Satellite Communications System Projected

PM0603134591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Report by P. Orlov on new communication technology project "Koskon", place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Orlov] The communications system is one of the first sectors where the possibilities of the military-industrial complex can be exploited exclusively for civilian purposes. It is as though the telephone lines crisscrossing the globe were cut at our borders. There is no need to describe the communications situation in our country. Sixty billion [units not given] are needed just to reach normal world standards, or tens of times less if space technology is used. These funds were raised by the founders of "Koskon", a newly created international innovation enterprise, by "clubbing together" as people might say.

[A.I. Ilin, chief designer of the project] The international joint innovation enterprise "Koskon"—in other words, "Space Conversion"—sets as its main task the creation of a global low-orbit satellite communications system to resolve information technology tasks in various sectors of the economy.

[K.I. Pobedonostsev, director of the Moscow Energy Institute Experimental Design Bureau] We also hope to create, successfully and in the shortest possible time, the cheapest, most effective information technology system for our country's education system and other areas of our social activity.

[Orlov] This is how the authors of the project picture it. Thirty-two satellites like this one [video shows diagram of satellite] are needed so that it will be possible with a handset this small to connect directly via satellite with another telephone anywhere in the country or in the world.

The first test launch was carried out on 29 January 1991. The speed of the operation is easy to explain: The main elements of this system are taken from military research and development work. There is also a prototype control system near Moscow, at the Flight Control Center, and at Medvezhye Ozera.

This is the view of those responsible for the manufacture of the rocket-satellite system.

[A.I. Dunayev, head of USSR Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology (Glavkosmos)] In any case, provided that the subscriber equipment that was shown here can be made sufficiently cheaply, the cost of the satellite itself and of the rocket of this type will naturally be minimal even compared with existing costs.

[Orlov] The consumers—that is, those who know our economy best—are viewing this with optimism, albeit cautious optimism.

[V.I. Khokhlov, USSR Deputy Communications Minister] We can now realistically speak of competitive systems. In this respect the "Koskon" system is noteworthy for the following reason: First, we see it as a system that complements existing systems and also as a system that complements our future systems. We are giving it quite an important and substantial role.

[Orlov] However, the ups and downs of economic life in our country can wreck any good initiative. In the case of "Koskon" this is countered by the common sense of real economics—achieving something through joint efforts. And if this is successful, we will be able to use satellite telephones in three years from now.

Limited Funds Hamper Antipollution Measures

PM1203164591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent M. Klepov at the the Perm Electrotechnical Plant, date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] In the report you are about to see we return to ecological problems. As is well known, great damage is being inflicted on the environment by industrial effluent. Unfortunately there are not many examples of effective purification of this effluent. It is therefore a special pleasure to report a major achievement in this sphere at the Perm Electrotechnical Plant.

[Klepov] One of the most harmful production processes for man is electroplating. Briefly, it consists of coating metals with various surfaces.

If heavy metal ions enter the human organism, they cause incurable diseases.

Now, for the first time in world practice, a technological process for the purification of electroplating effluent has been introduced at the Perm Electrotechnical Plant. The process was developed at the Ufimskiy Petroleum Institute. It is based on a biochemical method. That is, special micro-organisms are cultivated for this purpose. A production unit has been built at the plant and the necessary equipment has been installed. [video shows unit] Some 300 cubic meters of effluent are rendered harmless per day. This is sufficient for the plant's purposes. Incidentally, this method could also be used at other enterprises. Work on this has already begun.

At the same time scientists have sought to perfect their ideas, and they have come to the conclusion that the effectiveness of the new process could be sharply

increased. If this is achieved, the production process will be rendered completely harmless.

However, it has emerged that there is no money to continue this work. The funding of scientific research from the center has been discontinued, and the Electrotechnical Plant has no money either, since it is not making a profit. Because of acute shortages of raw materials the plan is not being fulfilled. All the ties with suppliers have been disrupted.

Scientists and specialists are unanimous. It is necessary to continue subsidizing science, otherwise many acute problems will remain unsolved or will be resolved only partially, as in the given case.

Military

Defense Ministry Interviewed on Referendum

LD1403000391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1851 GMT 13 Mar 91

["Political Dialogues" program with Army General Konstantin Alekseyevich Kachetov, USSR first deputy minister of defense; Army General Yuriy Pavlovich Maksimov, deputy USSR defense minister and commander in chief of strategic rocket forces; Army General Valentin Ivanovich Varennikov, deputy USSR defense minister and commander in chief of ground forces; hosted by V.P. Voloshin]

[Text] [Voloshin] The draft Union treaty and the army. This is the theme of our conversation. This theme is a matter of concern today for many television viewers. The first question is to you, Konstantin Alekseyevich. How is the referendum regarded in the Army and Navy? What feelings do the servicemen have with regard to the all-Union referendum being held on 17 March?

[Kochetov] The future of our generation depends to a large extent on the preservation of our Union, on what we leave as a legacy to posterity. Today it is appropriate to ask the question: The Union and defense, the Union and the Armed Forces—what are they? How are they interlinked? Surely these are two inseparable concepts. These two concepts are dialectically linked together as one. That is, there is no Union without powerful Armed Forces and there are no powerful Armed Forces without the Union. In general each depends on the other.

Therefore, in order—and it is perhaps fashionable to put it like this—in order for us to be respected by civilization and for us to be respected by other states, we need to preserve our great power, we need to preserve the sovereignty of our Soviet Union, we need to preserve our state—a new and renewed state with our sovereign republics having a large range of powers, but at the same time with a center which is clear, well-coordinated and, strong—and, one can say, able to worthily represent our power abroad, and guide all of our community that is so large.

Therefore, all of these concepts are very close ot the hearts of the servicemen of our Armed Forces. I consider that the servicemen in the Armed Forces have made their choice, their choice to go on 17 March to say yes to our Union. There is no other way in our state and the Armed Forces will say only yes.

[Voloshin] As participants in the war, looking today at those events taking place in our society, what feelings do you have? Yuriy Pavlovich, would you like to reply?

[Maksimov] Yes, indeed, the things that are happening now really make one think. If in our time we had entered the war without the unity of our society, without the friendship among the peoples existing at that time, one could hardly have counted on victory in the Great Patriotic War. By the way, Hitler, too, counted on the disintegration of our state, on undermining the friendship among the peoples. However, this did not take place because all the republics, the whole of our Soviet people at that time regarded the attack as an attack on their own home. and they regarded the defense of their fatherland as their own vital and sacred affair.

[Varennikov] I must say right away that we feel chagrin that the pseudodemocrats have been able to carry along with them a certain part of our society on a false path. I would like now to recall twhat has been said by some of our allies, in particular by Field Marshal Montgomery, a British officer. He said, at the end of the war—we have got that far—he said that the Soviet Army has no equal. Even if one takes the Armed Forces of all countries they could not stand up to the Soviet Army. We are proud of this. We achieved this only because we were able to mobilize all forces. This, in its turn, can be explained by the fact that we had a strong and monolithic Soviet Union.

[Voloshin] A number of viewers write to us that the impression is being created that we seem to have forgotten about military-strategic parity today, that it was precisely thanks to that parity that peace was preserved over all these years. But if our state begins to be divided up, if the Union is divided up, what will happen to this parity? How will this influence the defense capacity of the state, particularly since the military structures of the Warsaw Pact have in essence already ceased to exist and we are facing NATO alone.

[Kochetov] Parity is being preserved for the moment. But it is very apparent what danger it is in. If the country is divided up into a multiplicity of principalities with their own local military leaders, then obviously our parity will not recover from this. All the more so since now of course the Warsaw Pact, from 31 March, will cease to exist and we, in essence, counted on commensurate measures from the NATO bloc. But, the danger of war has not disappeared. It remains. Since it remains, therefore parity...[changes thought] and now parity must be maintained by us, by the Soviet Union, alone, alone, on a one on one basis. Therefore, here evidently, it is worth taking thought once again about our Union.

[Voloshin] Maybe that is why some people think that the danger of such a global war no longer exists in today's world. That is why there are these suggestions that, since there is no danger of war, we should...

[Varennikov interrupting] break up the armed forces.

[Voloshin] Break up the armed forces. But what do you do about nuclear weapons? Yuriy Pavlovich, strategic nuclear forces are a formidable weapon, are they not?

[Kochetov] All the more so, Yuriy Pavlovich, in that we owe the achievement of parity to...

[Voloshin, interrupting] Strategic nuclear forces.

[Kochetov] Strategic nuclear forces.

[Voloshin] So what will happen to them?

[Maksimov] When we talk about parity, we have our strategic nuclear forces in mind, first and foremost. The strategic missile troops are the core element in these. Our military doctrine is now a defensive one. One of the main objectives of this doctrine is to prevent war. The role of the missile troops in meeting this objective—in deterring and preventing war—is exceptionally great. Against the background of both unilateral and treaty-based reductions in armaments and substantial changes in the strategic situation, it has increased still further. Right now they are, of course, our state's nuclear shield, guaranteeing the security of our state, ensuring that it really is sovereign. There are suggestions being made to the effect that the Army, including the missile troops, should be broken up into ethnic components. Such suggestions are even heard from parliamentary rostrums. My view on this is as follows: either these people are incompetent, or there is some evil intent here. This is a distortion of reality.

What do the strategic missile troops represent? A missile complex cannot be created by a single republic acting on its own. Suffice it to say that more than 100 subcontractors contribute to the manufacture of a single missile.

[Voloshin] More than 100 enterprises.

[Maksimov] Of course, enterprises. A task of this magnitude is beyond the ability of any republic. The pooled military science and technology of all republics without exception is utilized. Furthermore, a single system of nuclear security has been set up. The safeguarding of nuclear security is centralized. This is a very important requirement. When the nuclear security of armaments is assured, when this danger—and not only for our own state—is made safe, this is a good thing.

Another factor is the unsanctioned operation of use of nuclear weapons. Again, the only thing preventing this is the single centralized system. A whole range of scientific, technical, and design features ensure that this does not happen. This cannot be accomplished if all the individual elements operate independently.

There is the question of control, of ensuring control and nuclear security. This is also based on a centralized system of combat control, also providing automated control.

[Kochetov] Yuriy Pavlovich.

[Maksimov] In other words...

[Kochetov] Are they really saying that each of 15 republics should have its own nuclear shield?

[Maksimov] Yes. That is another aspect of the matter. In other words, I would like to say that it is quite simply impossible, to technically break up this single, integrated monolith. Take the SPRYN, for example—the system for advance warning of nuclear missile attack. It is ridiculous to think that every republic could have its own system.

[Varennikov] If you will allow me, I would like to add a few words to what has already been said. It would seem that everything is clear as far as strategic nuclear forces are concerned. But what about ground forces? At first glance, one might think that they could in fact be divided up. But, you know, if you study the matter further, you will see that the ground forces cannot be divided up. What are ground forces? By the way, ground forces are also armed with Nuclear weapons. They have their own missile forces and nuclear artillery. The Air Force also has nuclear weapons, and the other branches also. Today the ground forces are deployed throughout the country. But the structure is such that, for operational reasons, some [military] districts encompass three republics—in the Baltic region or Transcaucasia, for instance.

[Kochetov] The Turkestan military district is an example of this.

[Varennikov] The Turkestan military district takes in the territory of five republics. Therefore, if you divide everything up, the entire structure will collapse and that will harm our defenses. However, that's not all. The point is that the infrastructure has been created in such a way that it is not possible for each individual republic to repeat it. Bases of various types, arsenals, airfields, control centers, scientific institutions, proving grounds and test sites are unique. There is only one of each for the entire army. This must be stated quite bluntly—not one single branch of the Armed Forces of the USSR can be divided up. Speaking generally, the Armed Forces of the USSR can only be united.

[Voloshin] Let's say, for argument's sake, that one of the republics does in fact secede from the Union. We have already agreed that overall defense capability will, of course, suffer. But what about the republic which secedes? Will it be able to stick up for itself? Could it find some way of creating a kind of defensive zone for itself? No doubt you have a view on this, Yuriy Pavlovich and Konstantin Alekseyevich.

[Kochetov] We have already—Yuriy Pavlovich and Valentin Ivanovich have both touched on this question. Of

course we—I am sure we—agree that not one single republic is capable of resolving the question of the defense capability of its own land. Not one single republic is capable of defending its own unity, freedom and independence. Only in unity, in a single union, with united armed forces, can we... only united armed forces are capable of carrying out this lofty mission given to us by the people. Therefore, it is an illusion, it is self-deception. It is not just a naive delusion on the part of those separatists, those nationalists who wish to distance themselves from the Union, who want to tear the Union asunder. It is all completely unrealistic. But, in the final analysis, everybody will of course understand, and the people will understand.

[Voloshin] All the same I would like to return to the strategic nuclear forces, Yuriy Pavlovich. After all, they are a formidable weapon. Is there any way the unity and indivisibility of these nuclear weapons could be preserved and protected so that they can be kept as a single, integral force, in one set of hands? I am thinking of an eventuality where, say, a number of republics leave the Union or refuse to sign the Union Treaty.

[Varennikov] A way of ensuring control, you mean?

[Voloshin] Yes. That's what I'm referring to.

[Maksimov] Well, what can one say about this? Generally, it is impossible to have strategic nuclear troops divided into different groups, because they are a single entity. If you remove just one element, the forces, as a whole, cannot do their job. It includes the issues of both tactical application, flight tasks, servicing, control and nuclear safety. All this will be upset. Therefore, in this case one should fully elminate strategic rocket forces. What does it mean, to eliminate them? It means completely undermining the country's security and rendering the country defenseless. Coming back to that point, it is impossible now to ensure the sovereignty, independence and security of the country or any republic without a modern army. It is not easy even for the Union to maintain a modern army, whereas it would simply be an impossible task for an individual republic. Therefore, it is simply unthinkable to formulate the question now, under these conditions, in the following way: how can one preserve? Under all conditions, the rocket forces must be an integral and undivided body subordinated to the center; and a centralized system of tactical control should be used. So much about that.

As regards the safety of our complexes, there is a whole range of measures there, including a whole range of measures excluding unsanctioned actions involving weapons, so that such a situation when these weapons could be used without sanctions or illegal acts could be committed, is excluded. The issue of security at defense sites has also been given very serious attention. There is a whole system of technical means there seriously excluding access to nuclear missiles. There is also a whole system of other measures that approach the issue of nuclear safety very carefully and attentively. Only a strong and single union and unified armed forces are truly capable of ensuring the real sovereignty, security and independence of both the homeland as a whole and the republics that form part of it.

[Varennikov] I must say right away that an individual republic, separated and seemingly independent, would doubtless become an object of attention of its other neighbors trying to turn it into a corresponding source of raw materials. It would certainly lose its sovereignty.

[Voloshin] Sometimes one can see that 10 or 15 nationalities...boys of different nationalities serve in a single collective and this company is like a single monolith. In other words, the army apparently consolidates all nationalities, representatives of all nationalities and republics. In this way, concerning the referendum, and servicemen's attitude to it, in case of a failure and of a number of republics separating, how can boys of the same [as heard] nationality serve in the same company?

[Kochetov] There are such subunits, especially in such districts as the Turkestan or Trans-Caucasian districts...

[Varennikov, interrupting]...or the Baltics.

[Kochetov]...where different nationalities account for up to 70-80 percent of personnel. Therefore, to say that our Armed Forces...[changes thought] and the fact that our Armed Forces are multinational is perhaps a merit of our homeland and our union. So each republic...if a certain republic adopts its own law or its own decision not to serve in the Army, this is not simply a violation of the constitution, it upsets the balance of our country's defense capacity. This issue is very painful because a shortage in the contingent of the Armed Forces, a shortage of crew personnel leads to lower combat readiness, a affecting defense capabilities and the level of training of the Armed Forces.

[Varennikov] Then the young man finds himself in a false situation, too, since there are two constitutions, two laws here.

[Kochetov] But on the whole, even with the present situation, one can say that they not only serve in the Army, in the same subunit, but they serve with their hearts open to one another. Therefore, we would like, of course, that our multinational Armed Forces remain; and they will be a reliable guarantor of stabilization in our society and state. I think that they not only will fulfill their task of defense but also will carry out the mission that is placed on our Armed Forces by the people. As for the Union, as for the forthcoming referendum on 17 March, I have no doubt that the servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces will say their clear and unequivocal yes to the Union. I have not doubt that our compatriots who, together with everybody, including the Armed Forces, take close to heart the situation of our state, I am convinced that they, too, will say yes to our Union because there can be nothing else. Therefore, I am calling on all our Soviet compatriots, I am calling on servicemen in the Army and the Navy, the families of servicemen

and all those who hold dear our Soviet Union to say yes to the preservation of the Union on 17 March, and by this we will preserve our great homeland.

[Voloshin] Well, let me thank you for taking part in the program and I hope that the conversation we have had here today will clarify a good deal, perhaps, for our viewers regarding the preservation of the Union, in terms of its defense sufficiency and the defense of our state. All the best to you, Goodbye till our next meeting on the air.

Politburo's Stroyev at Railroad Troop Conference

PM1403112591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[V. Linenko report under the "Official" rubric: "Party and Army"]

[Text] The railroad troops' party conference has completed the process of renewing the troops' party structure.

Lieutenant General A. Stolyarov, chief of the troops' military-political directorate; Colonel General M. Makartsev, chief of the troops; and other conference delegates noted that Communists stated their socialist choice in the course of the report and election campaign. They favor a Union of equal sovereign republics and unified Armed Forces.

Ye. Stroyev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, took part in the conference's work.

General Wins Law Suit For Defamation

LD1303152391 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Belyakov]

[Text] Samara March 13 TASS—People's court of Promyshlenniy District of Samara satisfied the lawsuit brought by General Albert Makashev, commander of the Volga-Urals Military District, against people's deputy of the Samara Regional Council, Karlov. The defendant must apologise to the plaintiff for slander and insults within a month.

General Makashev, known to criticise some actions of the Union government, is a USSR people's deputy. He had to institute legal proceedings after Deputy Karlov told his constituency that Makashev had been, allegedly, a military instructor in Baghdad, that he was involved in preparing the invasion of Kuwait, that "there is blood on his hands and there is no room for fascists like him on the land of Samara".

The indignant general turned to the regional council of people's deputies to demand that Deputy Karlov answer for his words. He was supported by the local council and then brought a lawsuit to a people's court.

Transcaucasus District Disarmament Department

91WC0077A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by Sakinform—TASS correspondents Major B. Kononenko and V. Golovin: "Disarmament Department"]

[Text] A new department dealing with disarmament issues has been formed in the Transcaucasus Military District. As in other districts also, incidentally. This was done in accordance with the signing by the leaders of the 22 countries representing the Warsaw Pact and NATO of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe on 19 November last year in Paris and the impending ratification of this important document. The work the department will perform was described by its chief, Colonel V. Zorin:

"By our activity we are to ensure realization of the treaty and create all the conditions stipulated for its consistent implementation. We will monitor the movement of military equipment and arms both in the district and outside, register the pieces to be destroyed, and support the work of foreign delegations on the territory of the Transcaucasus Military District. Following ratification of the treaty the work of the inspection groups will begin. All this is akin to diplomatic activity. After all, cooperating with the representatives of the 21 countries that signed the treaty, we represent not only the okrug but our entire state also.

"We will necessarily establish the essential contacts with the Councils of Ministers, Foreign and Internal Affairs Ministries, and the KGB of the republics of the Transcaucasus. I am sure that the governments of Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan will be attentive to our joint activity. After all, they themselves are raising many of the questions with which we will be dealing."

Artillery Marshal on Equipment, Cutback Problems

LD1303221191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Interview with USSR Marshal of Artillery Vladimir Mikhaylovich Mikhalkin, head of the USSR rocket and artillery troops, by unidentified correspondent, date and place not given; from the "Armed Forces and Society" program—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Numbers are now being cut in the armed forces. At the same time, the rocket and artillery systems and complexes are being cut. Is there not some sort of exaggeration here, to the effect that we might be left with nothing? After all, the military threat has not decreased at all, in spite of the alleviation of the general global situation.

[Mikhalkin] No, there should be reasonable sufficiency in everything; furthermore, in cutting our armed forces we should take the quality of arms into account and the high level of training of the cadres, especially the officers.

We train good officers. They will be able to fulfil the tasks that will face us when the armed forces are cut. You see how things are. Policy must be built on a basis of both the economy and the defense power of the state, and I consider that our politicians should take this into account in holding various talks. Our Army is a strong one, our Army is well equipped. If the armed forces are cut in NATO countries, we are also ready to cut, but we must not in any circumstances lose...

[Correspondent, interrupting] There should be a limit of sufficiency.

[Mikhalkin] [words indistinct] And I think that this limit should be given by scholars and military men, and this framework of Army sufficiency should be well grounded, not simply...[changes thought] We sometimes have comrades, let's not beat about the bush, who are dilettantes, who on a wave of emotion say that this or that mut be cut, without basing this on any facts or any figures.

[Correspondent] In the past few years there has been a lot of talk that sometimes our hardware, our defense industry, is sometimes backward, and that sometimes it is even accepted with some [words indistinct] that there are such and such mistakes, and this applies to rocket and artillery hardware.

[Mikhalkin] There are, there are. The fact is that the technology of production still suffers. If designers design a good weapon, industry is still at such a technical level that they make errors in production. But we are in close contact with them, they correct these errors, and try not to repeat them. Perhaps the military acceptance body doesn't work well enough. There is mass production going on, and there are not enough representatives of the military acceptance body to be able to check every assembly, component, and mechanism on every item of hardware in detail. But I think we should appeal to the working class to work more honestly, and they must know that this is a weapon which must not let us down in combat. I think the working class will understand our request.

Poll on Attitudes Toward Army Reported

PM1103095791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by A. Levinson: "The Army: A Sideways Look"]

[Text] At the end of 1990, the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion polled a representative sample of 1,848 respondents in 16 regions of the country. Inter alia it ascertained society's opinion of the daily living conditions of privates and officers in the Soviet Army.

Those who like to repeat that "the army is a part of society" do not always like to hear society's opinion of this part of it. How, they say, can civilians know how matters stand in the army?

Here's how. Over half of those polled (53 percent) stated that among their relations and close friends, there are people who have served or are serving now in the army or are going to serve.

Of course, in part these are our respondents themselves.

The figure of 53 percent—let us note in passing—attests to how incredibly large this "part of society" is in the blessed era of disarmament, reduction, and nonparticipation. And if we also add all those who "forge swords" (sometimes without knowing it themselves), what percentage of the population will then be connected to some degree or other with the military-industrial complex?

Over one quarter of those polled had no opinion about what daily living conditions are like for officers in the Soviet Army units. One-fifth did not answer the question about soldiers' daily life. The opinions of the others broke down as follows. Some 33 percent called daily living conditions for officers "very good" or "good" and 21 percent described them as "very good" and "good" for privates. The corresponding figures for "very poor" and "poor" were 40 percent for officers and 60 percent for privates. Consequently the overall conclusion is that in the opinion of the majority, daily living conditions in the army are poor.

As is usually the case, differences of opinion lie behind the overall figures. Who thinks otherwise? For instance, among the oldest age groups the majority are "optimists." This can be explained in part by the fact that these people, by virtue of their advanced age, are far removed from the realities of army life and communication with military men. And in part by the fact that the respondents in these groups in general choose "good" more often. (It is their viewpoint which people like to present to us as the opinion of society as a whole).

Outbursts of optimism are also encountered in other groups. Thus, among men who have reported that they are members of the CPSU and also among men with incomplete secondary education there is an unusually large group—10-12 percent—which asserts that daily living conditions for officers are "very good." (On average about six percent voice this opinion). One out of every ten of the oldest respondents and of the CPSU members even considered soldiers' daily living conditions to be "very good." Among those who identified themselves as "nonparty people" only one in every 100 voiced this opinion.

Among boys of predraft age, there is a proportion, albeit three times smaller (three percent), who believe that "very good" daily living conditions await them in the army while a further 10 percent believe that conditions for soldiers are "good." Among the age group which consists mainly of those who have just returned from active service, the proportion of optimists declines drastically. Not a single man in the 20-24 age group speaks of "very good" daily living conditions for soldiers, less than three percent have difficulty in answering, four percent

chose the reply "good." The remaining 93 percent chose the remaining two options for an answer.

In principle it is not idle to ask: Have certain mass media not formed this public opinion?" In this case we can answer the question. Indeed, readers of IZVESTIYA, for instance, are two percent less optimistic and six percent more pessimistic on this issue than the population on average. Readers of OGONEK are three percent gloomier again. But their answers can be broken down as follows: For each one who says "good" there are four or five who say "bad" (the average is three). In the answers of the recently demobilized (who, alas, do not regard these publications with very great favor) one "good" has 23 adversaries who contradict him. These are not people who have "read their fill," they are people who have had their fill of suffering.

Among women there are those who are particularly perturbed by this problem. First, they are women with higher education; second, those whose families include a career military man; and third, Russian women living outside Russia.

Men are characterized by a 50 percent dominance of negative opinions over positive in answers to this question. Young men who have served in the Army interpret the officer corps' position more seriously than anyone. Among them, and also among men who could be their fathers and who are consequently also concerned about the state of affairs in the Army, there is a minimal number prepared to say that the officers' lot is sweet.

It emerged that officers' humdrum existence and daily life particularly perturb people who like to read and who collect large libraries, readers of OGONEK, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and IZVESTIYA. There is an increased number of answers stating that everything is "very good" for officers on the daily living plane among subscribers to PRAVDA, MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, MOSKVA, and some other publications.

Baltic Republics

Assistance Funds Demanded From Baltic Republics

LD1303123691 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0630 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Ivars Godmanis, the chairman of the Republic of Latvia Council of Ministers, yesterday in Moscow attended a sitting of the cabinet of the USSR Council of Ministers at which political questions of the USSR were discussed. Representatives of the center gave an ultimatum to Lithuania because it has decided not to take part in the formation of the common assistance fund for necessary compensations as a result of the rise in prices. Demands for money for setting up this fund were also made on Latvia and Estonia.

Estonian Commissions Prepare for Referendum

LD1403053291 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1500 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] The organizing commission set up by both the interregional council and by the Communist Party of Estonia (on the CPSU platform) for the 3 March referendum, and for the poll in some areas, has taken it upon itself to coordinate the 17 March referendum in Estonia. This commission is headed by Nikolay Zakharov, secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia (on the CPSU platform) Central Committee. In localities the referendum will be organized by constituency commissions, said Nikolay Zakharov to ETA. In Narva, Kohtla-Jarve, and Sillamae, where the local authorities support the all-Union referendum, there are no problems, and voting will take place at the same polling stations and according to the same lists as the 3 March referendum. Elsewhere constituency commissions have been set up upon the production-territorial principle.

In addition to northeast Estonia, there have been nine constituency commissions and 184 polling stations' commissions set up in Estonia. Lists are being prepared by the work collectives that have decided to take part in the referendum. These are the so-called main lists; included in additional lists will be their family members, as well anyone else who wants to take part in the referendum. A passport with an address stamped in it will serve as a basis for voting. As far as the military are concerned, they will be organizing a referendum by themselves. Wherever possible, they will organize polling stations beyond the military units' territory, so that local people can also turn up to express their will.

The claim that Admiral Belov is in charge of organizing the referendum in Estonia does not hold water, Nikolay Zakharov emphasized. The referendum will be carried out by constituency and polling station commissions. The republican organizing commission takes on the coordinating and helping role. Necessary funds and voting slips come from the USSR Central Elections Commission, the chairman of the republican organizing commission noted. Nikolay Zakharov added that the lists, on the basis of which paticipation in the referendum will take place, will not be made public; once referendum results have been established the lists will be destroyed, upon a decision from the voting commission. This is what the chairman of the republican organizing commission said to ETA.

Estonian Legislature Rejects Treaty Discussion

LD1403083691 Mosow TASS in English 0800 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn March 14 TASS—The Estonian parliament does not intend in the near future to discuss a draft treaty on a union of sovereign republics as an out-of-order item.

A proposal to put the discussion of the draft treaty as an item on the agenda of one of republican parliament meetings was made "by the equal rights group which is against Estonia's secession from the USSR. When put to the vote, the proposal was turned down by 58 votes to 15.

Estonia is known not to have taken part in the elaboration of a Union treaty. When endorsing recently the results of a republican poll on the restoration of the state sovereignty of the Estonian Republic, the republican parliament declared that it was impossible for Estonia to be a party to a Union treaty on any grounds whatsoever.

OMON Warns of Latvian Plan To Seize TV Center

LD1403112691 Riga Domestic Service in Russian 1009 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Today the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIA publishes a statement by the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Units] command. It says that the mass media are whipping up the atmosphere to discredit the Black Berets, and allegedly with the aim of destabalizing the situation in the republic on the eve of the all-Union referendum [words indistinct]. The OMON command reportedly has facts at its disposal showing that from 14 to 17 March radically minded Latvian fighters propose to dress in OMON uniforms and occupy the television center and to blame possible casualties on OMON.

The journalists of Latvian Radio deem this statement in SOVETSKAYA LATVIA as a provocation. We await an official explanation from the authorities on this matter.

Latvian Pro-Referendum Groups Coordinate Efforts

PM1303170591 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 7 Mar 91 p 1

[Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Press Center report: "Promote and Support the All-Union Referendum!"]

[Text] A conference of representatives of Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] sociopolitical and public

organizations and movements which favor holding the all-Union referendum in the republic 17 March 1991 was held 6 March in Riga at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Sociopolitical Center.

More than 1,200 mandates were issued by the conference organizers, in particular to representatives of the Latvian Supreme Soviet "Ravnopraviye" [Equal Rights] faction, the local soviet "Soyuz" deputies' group, the Latvian Communist Party, the International Front of Working People of the Latvian SSR, the Joint Council of Labor Collectives, the Democratic Initiative Center, a number of republic trade union organizations, war and labor veterans' councils, the Union of Young Students and Schoolchildren, the Union of Latvian Writers, the Council of Former Prisoners of Fascist Concentration Camps, the Charity Society, and many other Latvian sociopolitical and public organizations and movements.

The question "On the Tasks of Sociopolitical and Public Organizations and Movements in Connection With the Coming All-Union Referendum 17 March 1991" was placed on the conference agenda.

A.P. Rubiks, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Latvian SSR people's deputy, and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, delivered the keynote report at the conference.

V.M. Lashkov, deputy chief of the USSR Central Referendum Commission Secretariat, delivered a report at the conference.

The debate then unfolded.

The conference discussed and adopted a final document—an Appeal to the Latvian People—which will be published in the republic party press.

At the conference presidium's suggestion an aid group was formed, tasked with coordinating the actions of sociopolitical and public organizations to prepare for and hold the USSR referendum in the republic.

Latvian Legislators Calls for Referendum

LD1403042791 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Three members of the Ravnopraviye faction of the Latvian parliament today called on the Soviet parliament, constitutional compliance bodies and the prosecutor's office to enable citizens living in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia to take part in the March 17 referendum.

The lawmakers also invited all interested representatives of Russia to visit the Baltics before March 17 in order to see for themselves how events there will develop, "How pluralistic radio and television programmes in the three republics will be and how the floor will be given to supporters and opponents of the Union referendum".

In a statement published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA the deputies said that the division of Soviet people into citizens of the USSR and citizens of republics has no legal basis, since neither of the Soviet republics, except Lithuania, has a law on citizenship.

In this instance, it is a legitimate right of every grown-up citizen of the Soviet Union to take part in the referendum, they said.

In addition, members of the Ravnopraviye faction, representing Russian speakers in the Latvian parliament, said those residents of Latvia who wish, should be allowed to take part in a referendum held in the Russian Republic.

The deputies also expressed alarm over a statement by the Latvian parliament that it will cooperate with the Citizens' Congress, an organisation they say is extremely nationalistic and bent on seizing legislative power in the republic.

The parliament's move poses a threat to civil rights of many Latvian residents, Ravnopraviye members said.

Faction Alleges Breaches in Latvia Poll Procedure

PM1403093991 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 5 Mar 91 p 1

["Statement by the 'Equal Rights' Faction in Connection With the 3 March 1991 Poll of Inhabitants"—SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA headline]

[Text] The poll of the population was conducted as a large-scale political act. The poll's main task was to "ascertain the proportion of Latvia's residents who do not consider an independent (one might say, up-to-date Europeanized) Latvia worthy of their aspirations." (ARTAUJA, page 22). This formulation of the question, which does not reflect the full complexity of the political situation in Latvia, its economic situation, or social and ethnic relations, can also be regarded as incredible naivete and provocation.

Prior to the poll, state structures, ranging from the Supreme Soviet to television, provided the population with one-sided information. The Supreme Soviet Administration of Affairs issued posters with money raised from all taxpayers urging inhabitants to give the answer "yes" alone. With unprecedented vim television equated "yes" with patriotism and "no" with treachery. It can be concluded that the poll's organizers ultimately regarded it as a large-scale manifestation of loyalty to the new political structures after more than 10 months in power.

In the week before polling day significant deliberate changes were made to the composition of precinct electoral commissions. Latvian People's Front [LPF] representatives alone were nominated to precinct electoral commissions at the "Aviatransprotsess" Science-and-Production Association and the Mangali Ship

Repair Plant by small LPF groups in violation of procedure—on behalf of the whole collective, as it were—and former commissions from these enterprises were abolished (69th and 28th precincts). All members of the electoral commissions from Riga's "Arta" fittings production association and Riga's electromechanical plant were replaced for no reason. There are official records in all these cases. Similar reports have come in from the Riga jewelry plant in Preyli city (20th precinct) and the RMRP [expansion unknown] lease collective. All these cases are clearly in breach of the Resolution on the Procedure for Conducting Polls of Latvia's Inhabitants (Article 8). For instance, in Oktyabrskiy Rayon's 29th precinct 60 percent of the electoral commission was groundlessly replaced. The rayon soviet presidium there ratified the commission chairman without holding a sitting of the precinct commission.

When they took place early votes violated virtually all points of the resolution as regards the holding of polls and voting procedures. In Oktyabrskiy Rayon's 29th precinct ballot papers were dropped in a packing case and the ballot box was sealed in the sole presence of the commission chairman and secretary. Throughout the early votes most precincts lacked booths for secret voting. The ballot boxes were placed on the commission chairmen's desks—and that was where the striking out took place. Those taking part in the poll were surrounded with posters telling them to strike out "no" and leave "yes." The polling places' opening hours were changed without alerting all commission members and observers, making supervision difficult.

Observers from opposition public organizations were obstructed.

Electoral precincts did not keep voter lists, the register was kept in school notebooks. This gave participants in early votes the opportunity to cast their vote several times.

Deputy Yu. Dobelis disrupted campaign events in Leningradskiy Rayon's 45th and 47th precincts and Latgalskiy suburb's 15th precinct and threatened to put observers and certain commission members "in jail for 15 years."

Overt conflict occurred in the 21st precinct (Dobele City) between the electoral commission and observers. Commission Deputy Chairman Mierklans said: "There's nothing for you to do here!"

Official records have been made of all cases of violations. The attached document contains more detailed information about the course of the early votes. All documentation was given to G. Blums, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, 2 March. Despite this, at a press conference the following day the chairman continued to claim that no violations had been recorded.

On polling day additional information was received about public organizations' finding it impossible to carry out normal supervision of the course of the poll. In some precincts attempts were made to bar Communist Party observers from supervising the poll. At the 16th electoral precinct a Communist Party representative was subjected to psychological pressure and taunts in which members of the militia and television cameramen were involved. It became obvious that the changes to the composition of the electoral commissions had a definite aim—monopolization of the poll by the LPF. According to observers' reports, they were unable to ascertain the total number of ballot papers at electoral precincts. That is why the poll results cannot be summed up reliably enough.

According to data at the faction's disposal, on the morning of 3 March 50 bundles of additional (spare) ballots—roughly 150,000-200,000—were taken out of the Supreme Soviet building in various directions.

A paradoxical situation developed in the course of the poll: People who have never lived in Latvia (Latvians resident abroad) voted, and people who left Latvia many years ago or died many years ago were included on the voter lists, yet at the same time servicemen and MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and KGB personnel who have lived in Latvia for decades were not given the right to vote (since they lack residence permits). For instance, residents of Block 2, No. 10 Sesku Street, Riga and No. 1 Staytseles Street (it is mainly servicemen who live at the first address and military pensioners with resident's permits who live at the second) were not included on the voter lists. At the same time members of servicemen's families also found themselves subjected to discrimination on polling days since they failed to receive notifications. Military men who protested at the discrimination were told to send cables saying "yes" or "no" to the Latvian Supreme Soviet.

Many voters said that they had been subjected to persuasion and therefore voted in favor of Latvia's finally becoming democratic. The question was couched like this: Are you "for" or "against" Latvia?
The main violations in the course of the poll were as follows:
—agitation on polling day;
—obtrusive supervision of voters;
—marks on the ballots for which the prescribed procedure made no provision;
—one person voting several times;
—violation of secret voting;
—violations in voter lists.

The report by the "Equal Rights" faction provides data with regard to specific precincts. The information has been generalized on the basis of protests lodged by members of electoral commissions and observers, along with verbal reports from Latvian residents recorded in the faction's journal.

It must be noted that some citizens, when reporting cases of violations, either failed to give their names or asked for their names not to be used in the official report since they were afraid of persecution.

The report reflects the state of affairs as of 2000 hours 3 March 1991. Data regarding violations in the course of vote counting, destruction of unused baliot papers, transportation of ballot papers to the Central Commission, etc, have not been generalized.

[Signed] S. Dimanis, chairman of the "Equal Rights" faction .

Latvian CP Bureau on Commitment to 'Dialogue'

PM0803114591 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 27 Feb 91 p 1

["Statement by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau in Connection With the Urgent Need for Universal Dialogue and Cooperation in the Normalization of the Situation in the Republic"]

[Text] In its frequent addresses to the leadership of party and sociopolitical organizations, the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, which is profoundly aware of the dangerous development of events in the republic, has insisted on establishing contacts and joint actions with the aim of overcoming the national crisis.

Here are just a few facts.

A "roundtable" meeting was organized 1 June 1990 on the initiative of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. However, the leadership of the Latvian People's Front and organizations and movements collaborating with it, except for the Enviromental Protection Club, ignored this meeting.

On 6 December 1990 the newspaper NEATKARIGA CINA published a letter from a group of Latvian academics who proposed that leaders of parties and sociopolitical organizations and deputies from the republic Supreme Soviet jointly discuss topical questions of interethnic relations. The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau immediately supported this proposal and designated the participants on its side and their platform. However, neither the Latvian People's Front, nor the legislature, nor the republic government deemed it necessary to even respond.

In January of this year, the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau responded to the initiative made by A. Gorbunovs, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet, on a joint search for sensible methods for the resolution of urgent political and social problems in society. Most unfortunately, the meeting that was held and the subsequent contacts with the leadership of the Latvian legislature did not bring any constructive results, and this was not through the fault of the Latvian Communist Party.

One assessment can be made of all this—deliberate sabotage, and in instances when contacts of this type were actually made, it was a political game.

We resolutely reject as suspecious statements and various kinds of insinuations from radically-minded Latvian People's Front circles and their supporters about the "aggression" of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee leadership and its unwillingness to get involved in dialogue and cooperation with the social forces that are sincerely concerned with the future of the Latvian people and really display their dedication to the search for mutually acceptable decisions in establishing civil peace and accord.

In this connection, the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau declares with all responsibility its continued dedication to open dialogue without any preconditions on all acute political and social problems in the republic's life.

The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau brings to the attention of all sides interested in dialogue the real possibility of finding a joint way out of the political impasse. These ways out are expounded in the statement made by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and the proposals he made during the meeting in the Kremlin with A. Gorbunovs, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, and A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

Now the main task of all parties and sociopolitical movements and organizations is to determine, by joint efforts, parameters of their coordinated actions that would help bring—not in words but in actions—the USSR president's proposals into the sphere of Latvia's public and state life.

We believe that Communists and people outside the party and all decent Latvian people are ready for urgent dialogue and for the cooperation of all sociopolitical forces in the normalization and further stabilization of the situation in our republic. All parties and sociopolitical movements that really desire civil peace and accord should be just as interested in this.

[Dated] 23 February 1991 Riga

Latvian CP Bureau Statement Opposes 3 Mar Poll

PM1103114191 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 26 Feb 91 p 1

[Text] The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau believes that the poll of the republic's inhabitants scheduled for 3 March 1991, in the course of which they are required to answer "yes" or "no" to the question "Do you favor a democratic and independent Latvian state?" constitutes a blatant attempt on the part of the People's Front majority in the Supreme Soviet to set its decision against the all-Union referendum on preserving the USSR scheduled for 17 March 1991 and to exploit the results of the poll for unseemly political intrigue and to increase the propaganda sensation and mislead world public opinion.

Aiming to secure the republic's secession from the Union by any—barring truly democratic—means, Latvian People's Front politicians want to find a prop to this end in

an ordinary sociological poll which they are nevertheless trying to give all the features of a referendum. However, this poll cannot supplant a nationwide vote (referendum) since the wording of the question on the ballot paper precludes choice and does not allow a democratic answer based on free will to a question now of concern to all peoples in the multnational Soviet state—should the USSR exist or not.

Today one cannot fail to notice the pernicious nature of the political course being pursued by the incumbent authorities for the entire population of the Latvian state, where people's standard of living is plummeting due to separatism and their current leadership's economic incompetence, the number of political and economic problems is rising, social clashes are worsening, and things are bleak for many of the people who risked their lives and health to liberate Latvia from Hitler's enslavers and who created a new industrial economy with blood and sweat.

In May 1990 the Latvian Communist Party put forward and reaffirmed on several occasions its demand that the problem of Latvia's state status—whether it should be a republic inside or outside the USSR—be resolved on the basis of the results of a nationwide vote (referendum) and only in accordance with procedure envisaged by law. The poll of the republic's inhabitants to be held 3 March does not fit in with this procedure. That is why, in accordance with the decisions of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies and subsequent USSR Supreme Soviet resolutions, its results will not have legal, social, or political consequences for the republic and cannot be the basis for the authorities' adoption of a decision on Latvia's secession from the USSR.

The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau urges all Communists and everyone striving for stability and legal order in our republic to do everything to prevent the poll's results being used for these purposes. To this end, when answering the question on the ballot paper, we recommend that the word "yes" be crossed out!

[Date] Riga, 23 February 1991.

Latvian Ministers 6 Mar Meeting Reported

LD0703113291 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0600 GMT 7 Mar 91

[Text] At the session of the Latvian Council of Ministers, its chairman, Ivars Godmanis, yesterday reported on the meeting of the cabinet of the USSR Government, at which financial relations between Latvia and the Soviet Union and mutual supplies of agricultural products were discussed. The government also discussed the Ventspils city program of rehabilitating residents, amendments, and additions to the Labor Code. It also adopted draft laws on insurance and emigration.

Latvian Public Security Chief Interviewed

91UN0990A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 21 Feb 91 p 4

[Interview with Director of Latvian Public Security Department Janis Baskers, by correspondent Dmitriy Mart: "On Security Service in the Latvian Republic"]

[Text] **On 24 January, the Latvian Republic Council of Ministers passed Resolution No. 33 "On the Latvian Republic Council of Minister's Public Security Department." This resolution was a practical implementation of the Latvian Republic Supreme Soviet's resolution of 18 January, "On Creation of the Unified Commission on State Self-Defense."**

The population is concerned. It does sound rather threatening—the Public Security Department! Among its main tasks, according to the Council of Ministers resolution, are the "creation of a public security and self-defense system," "handling issues regarding the relationship with the USSR Armed Forces contingent stationed in Latvia," issues related to "alternative service, legal issues, and the issues of its administration" and others.

We are offering our readers an interview with Director of Latvian Public Security Department Janis Baskers.

[Mart] Is not your department a KGB double? Does it not represent a parallel structure?

[Baskers] Our department does not duplicate the KGB's work. This distinction is reflected in our name: PUBLIC security, not STATE security. Besides, the KGB is involved in all-Union tasks.

[Mart] I was told that previously you served as a Supreme Soviet commandant.

[Baskers] During those tragic events in January I was simply at the Supreme Soviet defense headquarters.

[Mart] SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH of 18 December 1990, quotes the transcript of the Latvian Republic Supreme Soviet session, the 11 December meeting: "Minister of Finance Silins: The government intends to reserve or earmark (this is in regard to the MVD's [Ministry of Internal Affairs] 'miscellaneous expenses' in the amount of 42 million rubles [R].—D.M.) this amount also for maintenance of the republic organs of State Security—the Latvian KGB..."

[Baskers] It would be great if part of that money came into our budget. But where did this R42 million come from? What do you think?

[Mart] Probably, from our elastic budget. How much is allocated for your department?

[Baskers] Right now it is still under consideration. So far there is only a payroll fund for 11 employees.

[Mart] Was there a similar department in pre-Soviet Latvia?

[Baskers] No, there was not. There were other organizations that fulfilled our functions... I keep stopping myself from saying: Department of Society's Security. This is the literal translation from Latvian. This would have reflected the meaning more precisely, but we have to talk about it with the linguists...

[Mart] Whom will you hire as your employees? Former and current members of the KGB or the MVD? Whom would you give a priority?

[Baskers] Of course, we will look where these people worked before. But the main guideline is: We want to bring to this department the people who, while working in public or state organizations, or in municipal structures, had shown themselves as good specialists and organizers.

[Mart] Were you a CPSU member?

[Baskers] Yes. Until December 1989.

[Mart] And membership in other organizations?

[Baskers] The Association of Latvian Riflemen. This a sociopolitical organization. Before my appointment here, I was chairman of the board there. Our organization generally supports the Latvian Popular Front.

[Mart] Point 4.4 of the Council of Ministers' resolution mentions the transfer of some object "Pansionat" under your department's jurisdiction.

[Baskers] It is the "Pansionat" of the former Ministry of Health's Fourth Department. However, if the object is transferred to us, this does not mean that we are taking it over and evicting everybody. It is simply being transferred under the jurisdiction of the Council of Ministers and the government, and will continue to operate as before.

[Mart] Point 4.3 says: "Before 1 March 1991, to prepare and present for the Council of Ministers' consideration appropriately coordinated proposals on creation of a single service on forecasting extraordinary situations and liquidating their consequences, taking over these functions from the Civil Defense Staff." What kind of service is this, and what extraordinary circumstances are we talking about?

[Baskers] You know the tasks of civil defense. These are the functions on which it was founded...

[Mart] In case of nuclear war?

[Baskers] Yes, in case we are attacked, and the enemy uses weapons of mass destruction, that is, nuclear, chemical, or bacteriological...

[Mart] If you are involved in public security, then surely you will have your own surveillance system or service. As in the KGB.

[Baskers] To my knowledge, the KGB does not have such service, either.

[Mart] What about the department for protection of the Constitution? Intelligence? Counterintelligence?

[Baskers] No, no, no. There will not be counterintelligence, either.

[Mart] What about the department on protection of citizens' rights?

[Baskers] We do not have a department specifically with such a name. But quite often public organizations and individuals come to us with a variety information.

[Mart] What about a group on combating organized crime?

[Baskers] This is a job for the police.

[Mart] Do you maintain contacts with public security committees of other countries and republics, and if so, which ones?

[Baskers] You are jumping ahead of us! We do not have any contacts—we have not gotten organized yet.

[Mart] Do your employees have to suspend their party membership?

[Baskers] I think we will consider this issue and formulate our policy. So far we have no such problem. We do not ask employees who are just joining us now whether they belong to, or support, any party or organization.

[Mart] Are there CPSU members among them?

[Baskers] To my knowledge, no.

[Mart] To whom do you answer? Who has the power to fire you?

[Baskers] I was appointed by the decision of the government, therefore, I answer to the government.

[Mart] What if a former KGB officer comes to you asking for a job in your department?..

[Baskers] The question will be what kind of job he can do and whether he can be useful to society.

[Mart] Do you have contacts with the KGB?

[Baskers] So far, we have not had any, but there will be contacts with the USSR KGB Latvian branch. If not direct contacts, then indirect ones. After all, in accordance with their tasks, they are supposed to be interested what kind of organization is being created. We have functions that are completely different from the ones of the KGB. Please make sure you make it clear!

[Mart] Thank you!

I am curious—what does the KGB think about it. I have called everybody there, but they remain totally mum...

Baltic Military Council Protests Terrorist Act

PM1103113591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent I. Litvinova: "Military Council's Protest"]

[Text] In connection with the acts of terrorism committed 6 March, the Baltic Military District Air Force Military Council has sent an official protest to the Latvian Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers and also to the Riga City Soviet.

The protests stated that the act of subversion in the house where employees of the Yakov Alksnis Higher Military School live is a continuation of the series of explosions which have already occurred on Latvian territory and the military council assesses it as one link in the chain of anti-army manifestations and confrontation with servicemen in the republic. The Baltic Military District Air Force Military Council believes that the crime which was committed, like all previous ones, requires the most serious investigation and objective and detailed coverage in all the mass media, including Latvian television, IZVESTIYA correspondent I. Litvinova reports.

Inspectors Complete Check on Latvian Arms Depot

PM1103144591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[INTERFAX report: "Check at Latvian MVD Arms Depots"]

[Text] After a month-long check a group of inspectors sent to Riga from the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] has concluded that all that is missing from the Latvian MVD arms depots is the automatic weapons stolen by a detachment of the Special Purpose Militia Detachment during the attack on the Riga militia school and Latvian MVD building. The check was carried out in accordance with the statement from USSR People's Deputy Colonel Viktor Alksnis that the republic's minister of internal affairs had allegedly issued the "People's Front thugs" with 650 sub-machineguns from the Latvian MVD depots.

The commission from Moscow will continue its work to determine the specific firearms used in individual episodes of the events in Riga in January, INTERFAX has reported.

German Delegation Views Visit, Leaves Riga

LD0603022291 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1700 GMT 5 Mar 91

[Text] The delegation of the Free Democratic Party of Germany, led by Otto Graf von Lambsdorff, chairman of the party, left Riga today. A couple of hours ago at the airport, a news conference took place at which Lambsdorff told journalists about the results of the visit. He expressed the hope that the contacts successfully begun between Latvia and Germany will be continued and will develop in the most diverse spheres. An attempt will be made to bypass all the obstacles that might arise due to various circumstances not under the control of either country.

Mr. Lambsdorff positively assessed the all-Latvia poll and stated that he and the other members of the delegation had been very surprised at how many aliens had participated in it and had voted for Latvia to be an independent state.

In the course of the day, Lambsdorff visited Jelgava, which is the native region of his ancestors, met Ivars Godmanis, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Latvia, and met the republic's minister of foreign affairs, Janis Jurkans.

India Rejects Direct Contacts With Latvia

LD0803093291 Moscow TASS in English 0915 GMT 8 Mar 91

[By correspondent Sergey Karmalito]

[Text] New Delhi March 8 TASS—The Indian Government rejects a possibility of establishing direct economic, cultural and scientific relations with Latvia, said the Indian Foreign Ministry spokesman here, commenting on a statement by Latvian Indologist Viktor Ivbulis on Latvia's desire to develop contacts with New Delhi, "by-passing Moscow".

India is in favour of a strong and stable Soviet Union, the spokesman noted. India believes that questions concerning the nature of relations between the centre and the Republics forming the USSR should be settled by the Government and the people of the Soviet Union.

All relations between India and the Union republics will be conducted in compliance with the Soviet Constitution and Soviet laws.

Professor Viktor Ivbulis, who participated in a seminar on Indian culture here, said in an interview with the Press Trust of India news agency, published in New Delhi, that Latvia is now in a "process of revolutionary transition to democracy and independence".

According to the professor, Latvia is interested in "direct cooperation with India and other countries", since it decided "to secede from the USSR and turn into an independent state".

Recalling the results of the recent poll in Latvia, Ivbulis alleged that its advance towards complete independence from the USSR "is irreversible".

Ivbulis said that he had a letter from the Latvian Public Education Ministry with a proposal to establish an exchange of students and researchers between Indian and Latvian higher educational establishments "bypassing Moscow".

Latvia Establishes Migration Quota Structure

LD0903133991 Riga International Service in Latvian 0530 GMT 9 Mar 91

[Text] The Council of Ministers of the Republic of Latvia has accepted a draft law on emigration. During the transitional period to independence, it will regulate emigration from and entry into Latvia. The annual quota has been fixed at not more than 0.2 percent of the number of the republic's indigenous inhabitants. The law will promote formation of a permanent composition of inhabitants in the republic.

Lithuania Sees 'Danger' in Troop Movements

Union Denies Increased Presence

LD1303140291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—Representatives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB have rejected assertions by the Lithuanian leadership of an increase in the number of their troops in that republic.

General Yevgeniy Nechayev, deputy head of the Military and Political Directorate of Internal Troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR, described the excerpts of a statement by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania disseminated by the "POSTFAKTUM" agency alleging that the number of KGB and MVD troops in the republic had been increased on the eve of the all-Union referendum of 17 March as "pure invention."

"Apart from the units already in Lithuania, no new ones have been dispatched there and no new tasks have been given them, Yevgeniy Nechayev told a TASS correspondent. There has simply been a replacement of several subunits of airborne assault troops, who have fulfilled their tasks in guarding various facilities, by soldiers of the internal forces."

According to figures from the leadership of the USSR KGB, which have come to the knowledge of the TASS correspondent, "there is no question, and cannot be any, of increasing USSR KGB troops in Lithuania." As for the statement of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, the leadership of the KGB regards this document as yet another attempt by the leadership of the republic to whip up the atmosphere on the eve of the reference and to justify, in particular, the fact that the defenders of the Supreme Soviet of the republic have Stinger missiles, as was stated a few days ago by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania in an interview to the weekly SOYUZ.

Pullout From Germany 'Great Danger'

LD1303205491 Hamburg DPA in German 1932 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—The Lithuanian Government sees a "great danger" for the Baltic republic in the handling of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Germany via the sea link from Mukran on Ruegen to Klaypeda in Lithuania. Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius stated this in Vilnius to the "BERLINER ZEITUNG" (tomorrow's edition).

According to the newspaper, the Lithuanian head of government makes it clear that in Vilnius they assume that the Baltic republic will have the right to have a say in this question. There is still hope that there will be agreement between Warsaw and Moscow on the provisions for the transit of troops (on land). Should the ferry port of Memel be used to a large extent for these purposes, however, then first of all there have to be negotiations between Vilnius and Moscow. According to the "BERLINER ZEITUNG", the Lithuanian head of government stresses that the very transit of large contingents of troops and equipment would create enormous costs for the Baltic republic.

Would Mean 'Enormous Concentration'

LD1403090991 Berlin ADN in German 0043 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—The Lithuanian Government sees a "great danger" for the Baltic republic in the Soviet troop withdrawal from Germany via the Mukran-Klaypeda ferry. This was stated by Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius in Vilnius in an interview with BERLINER ZEITUNG.

The Lithuanian head of government had made it clear, the newspaper reports on Thursday [14 March], that Vilnius expects that the Baltic republic will have some say in this issue. They still hope that there will be an agreement between Warsaw and Moscow on the arrangements for the troop withdrawal. However, if the ferry port of Klaypeda on the Baltic coast of Lithuania is used to a large extent for the troop withdrawal, there will first have to be negotiations between Vilnius and Moscow. The transit of large contingents of troops and stocks of equipment would involve the Baltic republic in enormous costs, the Lithuanian prime minister stressed.

Legislative sources in Vilnius point out that withdrawal via Klaypeda will at least temporarily lead to an enormous concentration of Soviet troops on Lithuanian territory, BERLINER ZEITUNG writes. In view of the continuing tense situation in the republic, this should be rejected. No one will monitor whether all the troops have actually left Lithuania.

Soviet Military Refuses Talks With Lithuania

LD1403071691 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] In view of more frequent violations of law and order by the military, an invitation was extended to the commander of the unit of the Soviet Union's interior troops, Major General Zhitnikov, to attend today a

meeting with the Government of the Republic of Lithuania. The commander of the Soviet Army Vilnius garrison, Maj. Gen. Uskopchik, refused to accept the invitation to that commander and to the deputy commander of the Soviet Army in the Baltic states, Lt. Gen. Goncharev. The reason stated was that the Army does not recognize the Republic of Lithuania.

The Lithuanian Government lodged a protest with the Soviet Union's Ministry of Defense.

Customs Building Blown Up in Lithuania 11 Mar

LD1303180191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1728 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—Referring to information supplied by the Lithuanian Ministry of Internal Affairs, IZVESTIYA reports today that an unprotected Lithuanian customs building was blown up by unknown persons on 11 March near the town of Salcininkai on the road between Vilnius and Lida (Belorussia).

Explosion Noted at Vilnius Commander's Office

LD1403103691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0930 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent Valdas Kanapienis]

[Excerpt] The sound of an explosion woke me this morning. I remembered 17 March at once, the coming referendum of the Soviet Union, and I thought that a wave of similar explosions which came from Estonia and Latvia could be a more frequent occurrence. The politicians of the neighboring Soviet Union will immediately create a threatening situation and will blame Lithuanian nationalists.

Well, we will probably hear about it on "Vremya" tonight.

You will hear more detailed information about the incident from this telephone conversation with Romualdas Venckevicius, an official at the Ministry of Internal Affairs:

[Begin recording] [Kanapienis] At 0520 today—I even had a look at the clock, I live in Antakalnis, [city rayon in Vilnius]—I was woken by a rather powerful sound of an explosion. Do you know about such an explosion in Vilnius?

[Venckevicius] Indeed, the city police commissariat has received a report on an explosion at the military commandant's office situated at the end of this [Antakalnis] street.

But there have been no particular consequences. It seems that a device of unknown manufacture exploded at the gates of the military commandant's office. At the moment the incident is being investigated by a special inquiry group. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Lithuanian Government Statement on Referendum

PM0803124291 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 27 Feb 91 p 1

["Statement by the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and Government on the Preparations for the 17 March 1991 Referendum in the Soviet Union"]

[Text] The Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and Government point out that since 11 March 1990, no laws or resolutions adopted by USSR authorities have been operational in Lithuania or in any way binding upon its people. The USSR leadership is well aware that the world community of states never recognized the annexation of Lithuania and that Lithuania was never part of USSR territory in any legal sense. Therefore, efforts by both USSR state structures and CPSU structures to bring influence and pressure to bear upon Lithuania with the aim of coercing its people into participating in voting in another state's referendum represent nothing less than gross interference in the Lithuanian Republic's domestic affairs and a fresh encroachment on its sovereignty.

Out of respect for the generally recognized principles of equal participation in the world community of states and good-neighborliness between sovereign states, the Lithuanian Republic is willing to discuss and respond in the appropriate manner to requests by governments of sovereign union republics and the USSR government to allow authorized consular representatives to organize voting in previously agreed places for citizens residing permanently or temporarily on Lithuanian territory who freely express the desire to participate in the referendum, and to assist them in this task.

[Signed] V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet.

G. Bagnorius, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic

Vilnius, 22 February 1991.

TASS Reports Lukyanov Cable to Landsbergis

LD1303174791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1625 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius, 13 Mar (TASS)—"Only the laws of Lithuania operate in Lithuania, and according to the Lithuanian Republic's law on referendums no referendum is planned at the present time," Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has stated. His comment on the telegram received by the Lithuanian leader from Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has been dissemintated in the Lithuanian mass media.

The telegram from A. Lukyanov to V. Landsbergis informed the latter that by instruction of the USSR Supreme Soviet, a group of USSR people's deputies is

setting off for Lithuania to "observe the implementation of the USSR law on the referendum." It also contained the request "to help them carry out the USSR Supreme Soviet instruction without hindrance."

IZVESTIYA on Vilnius Referendum Plans

PM1303134491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Article by correspondent N. Lashkevich under the general heading: "On the Eve of the Referendum—Respect the Individual's Right To Express His Will"]

[Text] Vilnius—In resolving any political question which touches upon the relations between the Union and the republics, Lithuania pursues its "iron" logic: Since 11 March 1990 the republic has reestablished its independence, and therefore laws made by Union bodies do not apply in Lithuania and "are in no way binding on its people." IZVESTIYA has already reported the motives behind Lithuania's refusal to participate in the all-Union referendum. The Lithuanian leadership has firmly, at times without considering any of the realities, adopted an inflexible approach to resolving the problems which affect not just the interests of Lithuania, but also those of the USSR.

Common-sense politicians in Lithuania see the preliminary conditions imposed by the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the government on the arrival of "consular plenipotentiaries" to organize the voting (this is unacceptable even if only on the grounds of the vagueness of the condition itself) as nothing less than an unconditional refusal by the republic authorities to help USSR citizens living in Lithuania to enact their will regarding the country's future. This is a direct violation of human rights which does no honor to a republic demanding independence and democracy.

The attempts of a number of labor collectives and sociopolitical organizations to hold the referendum in the republic have been assessed by V. Landsbergis as "interference in Lithuania's internal affairs." The Lithuanian leader's position did not change even when the leadership of district referendum commissions was elected and precincts and districts were formed on the initiative of those same enterprise labor collectives, in the main those under union jurisdiction, and political organizations and social movements. At Thursday's session of the legislature he called these actions antistate and contrary to Lithuanian laws.

Despite overt pressure from the official authorities, in a number of places in the republic the 17 March referendum, to all appearances, will still go ahead. Against a background of intense political disagreements, when at one pole the Communist Party and the social organizations and movements affiliated to it, and also the military, are stepping up their activities, and at the other the legislature and the government are doing the same, such a confrontation becomes extremely dangerous. Nobody is making any compromises. The position of the Lithuanian leadership in relation to the referendum is clear. But how do the initiators of the all-Union referendum intend to hold it on Lithuanian territory?

In the words of V. Antonov, deputy chairman of the Vilnius District Referendum Commission and secretary of the Radiometric Devices Scientific Research Institute party committee: "The referendum will go ahead in Vilnius whatever the circumstances. The legislative basis for this exists: the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution dated 25 February according to which labor collectives and social organizations are granted the right to organize precincts, districts, and commissions in enterprises in those republics which refuse to hold the referendum. By the decision of a number of city enterprise collectives—they number about 20—district commissions and precincts have already been organized. There are three districts in Vilnius: the Vilnius District, the Naujoji Vilnia District, and a district formed on the initiative of the military. In our district there will be 23 precincts. The district commissions will check all the names and addresses. The matter is so important and fundamental that the slightest forgery or infringement of the rules must be excluded. Moreover the result is unimportant to us. Our main aim is to make it possible for USSR citizens who live in Lithuania to enact their will, which has been denied them by the leadership of the republic. Whether people answer 'yes' or 'no' or do not come at all is a matter for their conscience as citizens. It is important that they should be given the right to choose, and that conditions should be established for them to express their will freely."

[Lashkevich] "Following the tragic events of 13 January, people are mistrustful of central power. Recently there was an explosion near the Oktyabrskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] building, where your commission is housed today. The investigation will sort out whose conscience this is on; people are scared, however. Will they come to the polling places?"

[Antonov] "Let's wait until 17 March. But it is a fact that the population is afraid of persecution. However, I am sure that those who cannot imagine life outside the USSR will cast their votes for the preservation of the Union as a federation of sovereign republics."

The next few days will reveal how the all-Union referendum will pass off in Lithuania, what the results will be, and what obstacles will crop up in its way. One thing is obvious: The referendum in Lithuania will have a local flavor, and judging by the distribution of political forces and the results of the previous poll 9 February, not many people will take part in the voting. However, whatever the result of the referendum, the main thing is that all those whose opinion differs from that of the majority of people in Lithuania should be able to express their will without hindrance. This is their legitimate right, which we should all respect regardless of our political convictions.

Lithuanians Urged 'Not To Contribute' to Poll

LD1403054691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1420 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Remarks by Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, on the upcoming USSR referendum, place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] The Soviet Union's leadership is aware of the fact that the world community never recognized the annexation of Lithuania, and from a legal point, Lithuania has never been a part of the USSR. Therefore, attempts by CPSU and USSR state structures to influence and press Lithuania, to compel its people to vote in the referendum of another state, are nothing but crude interferences in the internal affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, and new encroachments upon its sovereignty. [passage omitted]

The councils of Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons, and the heads of some enterprises and offices in the republic, however, have adopted decisions to open polling stations in their enterprises and in their rayons so people can take part in that referendum. I wish to state that this action is incompatible with the laws of the Republic of Lithuania and with the interests of the Lithuanian state, and it is an anti-state activity.

Some officials of the CPSU in Lithuania, under the cloak of democracy, of some kind of opposition, or in defense of citizens who think differently, state that there would be no democracy if people do not take part in this referendum by another state. [passage omitted]

We have reliable information that 1 million ballots have been handed over to military units stationed in Lithuania. I think that there are large numbers of soldiers in Lithuania, but I do not believe they amount to 1 million. On the other hand, we are familiar with USSR voting practices in the past. I myself used to work in the so-called law and order bodies, and I had to—I do not remember what year—go to one rayon in the republic to investigate how 120 percent of the voters had voted in that rayon. We know that ballots used to be put into the urns with no one taking part. [passage omitted]

Such forgery has nothing to do with the people of Lithuania. This is not our affair, and I invite once again the citizens of Lithuania and people residing here to observe these matters calmly, and not to contribute with their activity or their behavior to that USSR referendum. [passage omitted]

Lithuania's Burokevicius Attacks Economic Policy

LD1303211191 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] The first secretary of the Communist Party of Lithuania, Mykolas Burokevicius, has stated that the economic policy of the present leadership of the republic has nothing in common with the interests of the people. In his press interview, he stressed the leadershp wants to tear the national economy of the republic from the all-Union one, and is leading it toward economic upheavals.

Professor Burokevicius said it is impossible to destroy the Communist Party of Lithuania, because it is an integral part of the people. The Communists, he said, are for the development of an independent, sovereign Lithuanian state within the USSR.

PRAVDA Interviews Burokevicius

PM0603084391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 1,3

[Interview with M.M. Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by Yu. Stroganov in Vilnius; date not given: "Nothing Immoderate"]

[Text] Since the tragic events in Vilnius on 13 January the mass media that reflect the Lithuanian legislature's view and also the so-called "independent" Russian press have literally bombarded the Lithuanian Communist Party with accusations of attempting a military coup. Here the real reasons for the social explosion in Lithuania are completely ignored.

The press is describing M.M. Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, as one of the main culprits to blame for what is happening. But distortions are again being used in the salvo of accusations. I asked Mikolas Martinovich to answer a few questions.

[Stroganov] Let me immediately ask an "unpleasant" question, Mikolas Martinovich: Does the Lithuanian Communist Party have anything to do with the creation of the National Salvation Committee?

[Burokevicius] Political speculation abounds, particularly with respect to the Lithuanian Communist Party's leadership. Everything possible is being done to maintain nationalist hysteria. Identifying the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee with the erstwhile Lithuanian National Salvation Committee falls into the same category. This is an utter invention. As is the allegation that the Army wanted to carry out a coup d'etat in Lithuania. Another fabrication is V. Zarovskiy's statement in the 7 February 1991 KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA that I am also a member of the Lithuanian National Salvation Committee. That committee, I stress, was formed spontaneously, without decisions from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee or the leadership of the Lithuanian Congress of Democratic Forces. There are documents prepared in the name of the Congress of Democratic Forces which I, as chairman, did not sign. In the complex situation people acted independently.

[Stroganov] How in that case do you assess the Lithuanian National Salvation Committee's demands? Do you consider its activity to be legal?

[Burokevicius] The Lithuanian Communists' path is the path of political struggle for the restoration of the operation of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution and USSR Constitution on the republic's territory. The rumors that the Lithuanian Communist Party wanted to carry out a coup d'etat with the help of the Army is an utter invention. The Lithuanian Communist Party does not possess, does not command [rukovodit], and does not summon military formations to help resolve state problems. Today the war of laws is still continuing, and the blame for this lies with the leadership of the Lithuanian legislature. The majority of people do not know which laws they should be guided by—Union or republic laws. As for the Lithuanian National Salvation Committee, it can be said that, in demanding acceptance of the proposals spelled out in the USSR president's appeal to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, it was also defending social justice and expressing the interests of certain strata of the republic's population—its working people, those who create material wealth. Obviously it also made mistakes. But as far as the Communist Party is concerned, it operates solely by constitutional methods. There is nothing immoderate in its actions. I agree with the USSR president that no social organization has the right to give orders to USSR Armed Forces formations.

[Stroganov] Does this mean, to take the argument a step further, that you regard the Lithuanian legislature as the legal authority?

[Burokevicius] Yes, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet was legally elected, although the deputies express the interests of only 41.2 percent of the voters on the electoral roll. The Lithuanian legislature's illegal actions are another matter. The 13 January events have their roots somewhere. Back on 11 March 1990 the republic Supreme Soviet, having canceled the operation of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution and USSR Constitution, in fact carried out a legislative coup d'etat in Lithuania by means of its interim fundamental law and other political enactments. After seizing power the separatist forces started to restore bourgeois institutions in the state, political, and economic spheres. A psychological war against the Soviet Union began. Hatred toward people with different views was also implanted—particularly toward Communists, the USSR Armed Forces, Russians, and Poles. The legislature and other Lithuanian separatist forces categorically refused to fulfill the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies resolution on the Lithuanian question, torpedoed the USSR president's decrees in Lithuania, and suspended the operation of Union laws in the republic.

[Stroganov] But nevertheless has the confrontation in Lithuania also followed ethnic lines?

[Burokevicius] It was to the separatist forces' advantage to split people along ethnic lines, and to some extent they were highly successful. But the main division is social and political. Between the supporters and opponents of a socialist path of development for Lithuania. For example, rural inhabitants are basically dissatisfied with the Lithuanian legislature's agrarian policy and its plans to return land to its formers owners and revive the hired labor system. The republic's urban worker has also found himself caught in difficult social conditions. It is irresponsible for legislative deputies to claim to speak for the entire Lithuanian people. The Lithuanian nation has rich humanist traditions. Lithuania is more than just Lithuanians. Its native inhabitants include Poles, Russians, Belorussians, Ukrainians, Jews, Karaim, Letts, Tatars, and others. It is their homeland, too.

[Stroganov] But let us return to the tragic events, Mikolas Martinovich. The passionate attention being paid to them is not abating. Give us your view of them.

[Burokevicius] They cannot be viewed in isolation from the war of laws organized by the republic's legislature. I have already spoken about this. And then in the first third of January 1991 there was a fantastic increase in food prices. This was the last straw. People took to the streets. Even a decision by the republic legislature to defer the price rise for a while did not placate the fuming people. They gathered for rallies and demonstrations and staged political strikes. But instead of dialogue with the masses the republic's leadership appealed to its supporters from all over Lithuania to come and gather at the Supreme Soviet building and other important installations to oppose the working people of Vilnius and stirred up nationalist forces in every way. The atmosphere was fueled by television and, particularly, radio broadcasts and by inflammatory statements by the republic's leaders...

...The well-known tragic events occurred. People died. The first fatality was a Soviet officer. Law-enforcement agency staffers—and representatives of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, who are being obstructed in every way, are working in the republic—will undoubtedly establish the real causes of the events. I believe that the consciences of the Lithuanian legislature's leaders should be torturing them over the deaths, that they bear the greatest responsibility.

[Stroganov] Could the tragedy have been avoided, in your view?

[Burokevicius] Yes it could. Lithuania's current leadership should have found a common language with the working people of Vilnius and the military in order to avoid the incident. The republic leadership should have rejected provocative actions and urged people to be reconciled. But the Lithuanian Government is using the 13 January tragedy to further fuel tension and intensify confrontation in Lithuania. The leaders of the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party are being particularly zealous in this direction. This is a dangerous party. How

much hatred there is in Kaunas television and radio broadcasts and some republic newspapers.

I am sure that humane relations bring people closer together and make them nobler, more openhearted, and more respectful toward each other. But representatives of the administrative structures created by the Lithuanian legislature and Sajudis representatives with extremist inclinations are hounding Communists and people who advocate the integrity of the Soviet Union. Communists are being persecuted and subjected to psychological and moral pressure. In individual areas there have been attempts at physical reprisals against Communists. Such phenomena testify that an antidemocratic, voluntarist system is taking shape in Lithuania under which human rights are being flouted. But let us be realists. It must be realized that Lithuania is one of the Soviet socialist republics, and confrontation with the Union only increases tension in the republic. Its leaders should not mislead people. Innocent people are having to pay for the fantasy world constructed by V. Landsbergis and his supporters. This, in particular, was discussed at the 17 February Vilnius meeting between the republic aktiv of the Lithuanian Communist Party and O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The aktiv meeting demonstrated Lithuanian Communists' political maturity and cohesion and their determination to struggle for the integrity of the Soviet Union.

[Stroganov] An active campaign to discredit the USSR Armed Forces is currently going on in the Lithuanian press. They are accused of every possible sin...

[Burokevicius] Soviet servicemen should not be jeered at, nor should their dignity be impugned. It is more sensible to help servicemen's families, so that their wives and children can feel the warmth, concern, and respect of our people, the inhabitants of Soviet Lithuania. After all, the Soviet Army is the guarantor of observance of the national interests of Lithuania's peoples and the territorial integrity of the Lithuanian socialist state, which is part of the USSR.

[Stroganov] Is there a way out of the crisis in which the republic now finds itself? What is the way? What should Communists do in this difficult situation?

[Burokevicius] We Lithuanian Communists are currently appealing to the republic's state and social institutions to make every effort to avoid confrontation and the division of society into warring camps. We are urging a search for a common language and the consolidation of Lithuanian society in order to find a way out of the political, legal, and economic crisis that has developed. USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's 10 January 1991 appeal to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet could serve as a basis.

Lithuania's Communists are the sons and daughters of the peoples who live in Lithuania. They love their republic and display the greatest respect for the Lithuanian people and their culture, language, traditions, and customs.

The Lithuanian Communist Party is making efforts to ensure that the national interests of the Lithuanian people and the other peoples living here are translated into social reality and that the rebirth of national self-awareness does not stop half-way. The Communists are convinced that it is difficult to realize humanist ideas on your own, without internationalist solidarity. Lithuania is not an isolated island. It is closely linked with the peoples of our entire country. Therefore Lithuania's socialist statehood, which is manifested in the form of a Soviet union republic, can ensure the free development of the Lithuanian and other peoples along the path of social progress. The Lithuanian Communist Party advocates an autonomous, independent Lithuanian socialist state within a federation of the republics comprising the USSR. Only the Soviet Union can ensure the territorial integrity of the Lithuanian state and the safeguarding of the national interests of Lithuania's peoples. Whereas the Lithuanian separatists' antinational policy will lead to the loss of Lithuania's national integrity and statehood.

[Stroganov] Following the tragic events in Vilnius the head of the Russian legislature demonstrated his well-known stance. What is your attitude to that stance?

[Burokevicius] I believe that the position taken by B. Yeltsin regarding the events in Vilnius overlaps with the policy of the Lithuanian separatists, who blame the USSR for everything. Yeltsin's political behavior in general does great damage to the ideas of the consolidation of Soviet society and hampers the country's emergence from the economic, political, and legal crisis. This is also evidenced by B. Yeltsin's 19 February statements on television. The demands for the USSR president's resignation are anticonstitutional and provocative in nature and are aimed at fomenting civil war in the Union and changing the state structure of the USSR. I condemn such bonapartist actions by B. Yeltsin.

[Stroganov] In February you had a meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. To what was it devoted?

[Burokevicius] In addition to myself, a number of comrades from Lithuania who are members of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission also participated in that meeting. The meeting with M.S. Gorbachev will promote an improvement in Lithuanian Communists' activity in the very complex political conditions at the present stage.

Lithuanian Government Adopts Food Rationing

LD1403055791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Having examined the order of state trade in the second quarter of this year, the government has decided

to trade in food products with coupons, and later with family cards, in the shops allocated for residents.

Coupons for non-food products will be abolished in April. There has been much abuse of these coupons. Some of the goods will be sold, in accordance with fixed norms, in the workers' collectives.

At the same time, the leaders of the Ministry of Trade have focused their attention on shortcomings in the organization of state trade.

Baltic Commander's Protest Over Fight Rejected

PM1303155991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 22 Feb 91 p 1

[Undated message from Lithuanian Prime Minister G. Vagnorius and Lithuanian General Prosecutor A. Paulauskas addressed "To Colonel General F. Kuzmin, Commander of the Red Banner Baltic Military District"]

[Text] We have received your protest of 10 February 1991 regarding the allegedly provoked fight in Verkiai Street in Vilnius.

We draw your attention to the fact that the protest was made on the basis of information that had not been properly checked, and the conclusions stated in it do not help to improve mutual understanding between military unit servicemen stationed on Lithuanian territory and the civilian population.

A fight broke out 7 February not far from Camp North, where the military unit is quartered, as a result of hooligan behavior among warring adolescent gangs from various residential districts of the city. During the fight, physical injuries were inflicted on serviceman A. Stokolos, and also on a police officer who happened to be in the vicinity of the fight. It has been established that at the time of the fight A. Stokolos was in civilian dress, therefore there are no grounds for alleging that he was beaten up because he was a serviceman.

Proceedings were instituted February 1991 in connection with the aforesaid incident. At the present time the participants in the fight have been established as: A. Polenskiy, A. Moroz, L. Sidlauskas, and others. Regarding L. Sidlauskas, restrictive measures have been taken—he has been remanded in custody.

The need for measures to prevent similar fights from occurring has been pointed out to the republic's internal affairs minister.

With respect,

[Signed] G. Vagnorius, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic.

A. Paulauskas, general prosecutor of the Lithuanian Republic.

Norway Awards Landsbergis 'People's Peace Prize'

PM1303153091 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 12 Mar 91 p 7

[TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA report: "Norwegian Peace Prize for Landsbergis"]

[Text] Vilnius—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis was yesterday awarded the "People's Peace Prize" which the Norwegian people collected to support the Lithuanian people which is struggling for its freedom. The presentation of the prize took place in Vilnius on the first anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Landsbergis expressed warm thanks for the prize of 2.8 million kroner, which was collected during the winter in a spontaneous action in support of the Lithuanian struggle for independence. Landsbergis made it clear in his speech of thanks that he wants Norway to follow Iceland's example and establish diplomatic relations with the Baltic republic.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Says USSR Civil War 'Unthinkable'

LD1403113891 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 14 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 14 TASS—Russian parliament President Boris Yeltsin said that "a civil war in the USSR is simply unthinkable. We have no such social contradictions between social groups of the population, between office workers, the intelligentsia, the working class, peasants, military." He said this during a conversation with readers of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper. The newspaper published the full transcript of the conversation today.

Regarding the political situation in the country, the Russian parliament president said that "the critical moment in the struggle against the system has set in. The system is waging the struggle to survive, is holding on to the levers of power". "I believe that the turning point either in one or in the other direction will be reached this year. But still, the democratic forces will win," Yeltsin said.

"The time has come to pass on from amorphous, insufficiently organised democratic movement to a strong party," Yeltsin said. "I must say outright that in no case do I claim to head that party. Quite the contrary I, for one, object to combining the supreme state post with the post of the leader of a party," he said.

Yeltsin believes it is necessary to consolidate such an authority in Russia as would enjoy the confidence of the majority of the people.

"Russia needs the presidency and at the same time a strong government," he said.

Asked how he visualises the future Union, the Russian parliament president said: "Russia will be in a union of

states that will have more power, more statehood and will voluntarily delegate some functions to the centre."

Yeltsin said that a few days ago he wrote a letter to state television chief Leonid Kravchenko, requesting one hour of viewing time on March 15. But Yeltsin said he was not sure he would be given an opportunity to appear on TV.

The newspaper informs readers that Kravchenko sent Yeltsin an official letter refusing his request "in view of an unfavourable response of the population to Yeltsin's speech on March 9, as well as in connection with the unfavourable overall situation in the country".

Regarding Russia's foreign economic ties, the Russian parliament president said that the Russian Federation had already concluded direct agreements with Turkey, Greece, Taiwan. Negotiations were underway with South Korea, Japan, the FRG, France, the United States.

Yeltsin Sees No Reconciliation With Gorbachev

AU1403113091 Hamburg BILD in German 14 Mar 91 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, supreme soviet, by H. Braun-Wollenberg; place, date not given: "Yeltsin: Reconciliation With Gorbachev—No!"]

[Text] [Braun-Wollenberg] Mr. Yeltsin, you called for Gorbachev's head. Are you running for the post of USSR president?

[Yeltsin] No, by no means. Russia is enough for me.

[Braun-Wollenberg] Do you have realistic alternatives to Gorbachev's policy?

[Yeltsin] Of course.

[Braun-Wollenberg] What are they?

[Yeltsin] First, there is a new variant of the 500 days program that is being drafted now. Second, Gorbachev wants to have a strong center and weak republics. He wants to maintain the system, and I want to destroy it. That is the basic difference. I propose strong republics with a center without a president, perhaps with a coordinating authority, possibly the Federative Council. The leaderships of the republics must resolve all problems.

[Braun-Wollenberg] If Gorbachev were to ring your door bell tonight, what would you do?

[Yeltsin] I would let him in. His first question would be: "Shouldn't we make peace with each other?" I would say: "Too late. The train has left. I suggested it three years ago." I recommended to him at that time to rely on the left-wing forces. But he allowed the right-wing forces to grow; they criticize him now and will presumably also remove him. But perhaps he would not ask for reconciliation. In any case, he wants to be sure that I do not claim his post. I told him repeatedly, however, that I do not intend to be an alternative to him. There is a lot of work to do here in Russia. I would tell him: "Don't disturb us."

[Braun-Wollenberg] Are you not concerned about the tough political campaign against you personally?

[Yeltsin] No.

Yeltsin Seeks Live TV Spot on Referendum

LD1303172191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1653 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, head of the Russian legislature, intends to express his views on the Union referendum live on television on 15 March. This was confirmed to your TASS correspondent today by Sergey Yushenkov, chairman of the legislative subcommittee on the study of public opinion, as he touched on yesterday's statement by Boris Yeltsin at a meeting with a group of nonparty people's deputies from Russia.

Yushenkov also stated that, if he is not granted a live spot on 15 March, Yeltsin intends to seek other opportunities to express his attitude to the event in question.

Denied Live Air Time

LD1403100791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0931 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian legislature, stated today that Russia reserves the right to insist on parts of the property of the Central Television Company after the signing of the Union treaty.

As was reported to a TASS correspondent here today at the press service of the republic supreme soviet presidium, this was the reaction of Boris Yeltsin to the written refusal of Leonid Kravchenko, head of the USSR State Radio Broadcasting Company, to grant the leader of the Russian legislature live broadcasting time on 15 March, before the referendum on the future of the USSR which is being held on Sunday.

Yesterday, Sergey Yushenkov, member of the republic's supreme soviet, told a TASS correspondent that Boris Yeltsin "will seek other ways of making public his attitude to the Union referendum" in the event of a refusal to grant him time on the air.

Russian CP Issues Appeal on Union Referendum

LD1303221291 Moscow TASS in English 2133 GMT 13 MAR 91

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—The Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party [CP] called on all Russia's

citizens to vote for the preservation of the Soviet Union on a new basis during the forthcoming all-Union referendum and for its prominent place in the international community.

"In compliance with a decision by the Fourth USSR Congress of People's Deputies, all of us should make an extremely important choice on March 17: To be or not to be for the Soviet Union as a renovated federation of equal and sovereign republics, where the rights and freedoms of any nationality will be fully guaranteed," an appeal circulated here today said.

The appeal was adopted by a plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party held last week.

"Your 'yes' or 'no' will determine the future of our country," the appeal stresses.

The document notes that the Soviet Union is a unique human civilisation which developed as a result of centuries-old joint efforts by all its peoples. Its territory is populated by 42 nations, 40 nationalities and 19 ethnic groups.

Twenty percent of marriages are mixed. Nearly 75 million people, or every fourth citizen, live outside their national territory.

The appeal says that "we should quietly map out ways to overcome negative developments, which were ignored for decades and to prevent some forces from pushing the country into a precipice in the heat of nationalist ambitions and egoism. These forces do not scruple any means in their struggle for power," the document stresses.

"Every adult person, irrespective of his or her nationality and social status, is now deciding the destiny of our homeland," the appeal says.

"During the referendum, his or her vote may decide whether the Soviet Union will remain a powerful state in world civilisation or break off into splinters as a crushed mirror."

Moscow Radio Reports Appeal

LD1303161391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] We have just received from TASS channels the text of an address by the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic to the people of the republic. It states that an unprecedented responsibility rests on the shoulders of each one of us. The cost of a mistake could be fateful, not only for the millions of people living on the territory of the USSR, but also for future generations. The Soviet people have always been known for their genuine concern for their country and high sense of civic duty in the watersheds of history. It is precisely this that has helped us to stand our ground in any trials, no matter how hard, the appeal stresses.

Moscow's Prokofyev on Union Referendum's Aims

LD1303181491 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Gvritishvili and Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS— Communist Party members in Moscow in the run-up to the March 17 referendum on whether to preserve the Soviet Union should concentrate on explaining to people that they will vote "not for Gorbachev or Yeltsin but for the future of their country", Moscow party chief Yuri Prokofyev said today.

Speaking at a news conference here, he said that "certain political forces" are trying to distort the popular view of the referendum by describing it as a personal showdown between Kremlin leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Russian president Boris Yeltsin.

He noted that many voters, misled by these forces, now say that they will vote not for or against the Soviet Union but for Gorbachev or Yeltsin.

"However, even biologically Gorbachev and Yeltsin, regardless of who of them will lead the country, have some ten years at their disposal, considering that each is now 60. What is at stake, in the meantime, is a state, its ethnic groups and their future for hundreds rather than ten years ahead," Prokofyev said.

However, not just people in the street but even some intellectuals fail to realise this, he added.

He supported his observation by reporting the latest public opinion survey as showing Moscow factory and office workers and a considerable section of the pensioners generally supportive of the Union. There were fewer such people among intellectuals and students, although they are the most educated, Prokofyev said.

Moscow communists are targeting these groups in their explanatory work, he continued. One of their arguments: The breakdown of the USSR will adversely affect Moscow as well. Over one million people may lose jobs as a result among research workers and technical specialists alone, according to Prokofyev.

Considering all this, the vast majority of Moscow communists will vote for preserving the Soviet Union as an integral state, he said.

Oryol Region Councils Reject Russian Referendum

LD1403043791 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Likhopek]

[Text] Oryol March 13 TASS—More than 90 per cent of lowest-level governing councils in the Oryol region in central Russia have decided not to hold on their territories the Russian referendum on whether the Republic needs a popularly-elected executive presidency, a local newspaper reported.

ORLOVSKAYA PRAVDA said the 206 rural and town councils say the vote "contradicts the constitutional norms of the Russian Republic and the Soviet Union as a whole".

More than 20 higher-level, district councils have taken a similar decision, asking the regional council to convene a special session to discuss the expediency of holding the Russian referendum.

Most councils also appealed to voters taking part in the countrywide referendum on the future of the Soviet Union to support the preservation of the USSR.

Bashkir Legislature Views Upcoming Referendums

LD1403055391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] The institution of the post of yet another president on what is virtually the same territory will lead to diarchy, anarchy, and chaos, it states in an appeal to the population of the republic adopted today at the session of the Supreme Soviet of Bashkiriya. This came into being in the course of heated debates on the issue of holding the Russian Soviet Federated Soviet Republic referendum in Bashkiriya. Opinions were divided, and then the sides came to the decision to hold the referendum here after adopting an appeal to the republic's inhabitants.

The deputies unanimously adopted a decision on holding the all-Union referendum. They displayed a rare unanimity in abolishing the republic's agricultural industry complex, having formed the Ministry of Agriculture and Foodstuffs in its place. The minister's portfolio was awarded to the only candidate, (Gebitov), former chairman of the Agriculture Industry Committee.

After that the session broke off its work. The deputies set out for their constituencies to make preparations for holding the referendum.

Democratic Party Urges 'No' Vote on Referendum

LD1303232391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] The Democratic Party of Russia has appealed to citizens of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] to say "no" to the question of the Union referendum. The draft Union treaty dismembers the Russian Federation into a number of separate republics and locks them directly to the center—this is the view of Nikolay Travkin, chairman of the Democratic Party of Russia. The signing of this treaty would be nothing but the dismantling of Russian statehood. The favorite method of the CPSU nomenklatura, divide and rule, has once again been put into action. Our "no" to the question in the Union referendum, the statement by the Democratic Party of Russia says, is a "yes" to the preservation of the Russian Federation.

Khasbulatov Views Union, RSFSR Referendums

LD1303224691 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1645 GMT 12 Mar 91

[Interview with Ruslam Imranovich Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, supreme soviet, by Sergey Nosovets, RSFSR people's deputy; place, date not given; from the "Russian Legislative Herald" program—recorded]

[Text] [Nosovets] Just a few days remain before two referendums are held on Russian territory and these days are full of enormous tension and enormous promotional impetus from both sides. At the same time, it seems to me, there are questions which should be anwered prior to the referendum and answered by the most competent sources, as the saying goes. Ruslam Imranovich, the following question is constantly on my mind. Observing the agitation campaign or taking part in it, I cannot help noting its considerable bias. Whereas a massive propaganda campaign in favor of the Union issue has been underway on Russian territory, our Russian issue is either directly boycotted, silenced or distorted to such a degree [word indistinct] that the elector ends up with a strange impression. Will you comment on this situation?

[Khasbulatov] I would like to greet our television viewers, to wish them success, calm and reasonableness in our disquieting times. Now about our two referendums. You are aware that the positions of both the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and myself in relation to the Union referendum was unequivocal. Since the USSR Supreme Soviet announced this referendum, it must be carried out. Therefore, we proposed at the supreme soviet presidium and at the supreme soviet holding such a referendum on RSFSR territory, although both specialists and deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet voiced many doubts about the ethical and even legal correctness of the question put forward for the Union referendum. We thought that this referendum should be held since it was announced by the USSR Supreme Soviet, but our Russian referendum should be held at the same time. Finally, I will not mention many different interpretations, you will remember that, initially, there were two questions. In my view, the first question, as formulated by many deputies, was very logical and, one could say, attractive from the legal point of view: Whether or not RSFSR citizens want to preserve the unity of the RSFSR. Who could object to such a question? It seemed no one could. But later some forces emerged which started asking questions and saying it was aimed against the peoples living in autonomous republics and so on. On the whole, we managed, frankly speaking, both Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] and myself,

to persuade our deputies [word indistinct] to remove this questions since it provoked different interpretations. We have left an indisputable question: Do our citizens want to have a president in Russia? What does it mean, to have a president? It means to have a head of the Russian state. So far, of all the 15 republics, Union republics, Russia is the only one which does not have a head of state of its own. Boris Nikolayevich is head of the legislature and I am his first deputy. Should we have a normal government, should we have a normal head of state to solve our vital issues, food issues, state and political issues or should we not? That is the point. If your compatriots wish to say no, we do not need a head of the Russian state, well, this is their wish. But it seems to me that our compatriots will say, of course, yes, we need a head of state. It should not necessarily be Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Let Abdulatipov, say, enter the fray or...

[Nosovets] ... or Polozkov.

[Khasbulatov] ... or Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov or I do not know who else, perhaps, Boris Mikhaylovich Isayev or somebody else.

[Nosovets] ... Svetlana Petrona Goryacheva.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, Svetlana Petrovna Goryacheva. Each RSFSR citizen has the right to join this very serious political struggle and to aspire to the post of head of the Russian state. But people must be given an opportunity to voice their opinion, that is the point. Therefore, you see, it turns out—and I was simply astonished at this first and very unhealthy symptom, to which I reacted very painfully—that the Smolensk Soviet suddenly announced that the referendum would not be held in Smolensk Oblast. [passage indistinct]

There must be no illusions. You know, I for one have great respect for the declaration and try to persuade representatives of oblasts and krays to take into account the fact that national-state formations are different from oblasts and krays and indeed we are expanding the rights of our republics. We have even given up the term autonomous republic. Nevertheless, in accordance with the Constitution, all repubilcs make up an integral part of the Russian Federation. Therefore, if Tataria, or Chechen-Ingushetia or any other republic, which is part of the RSFSR, adopted a decision to the effect that the RSFSR referendum will not be held on their territory, such decisions are illegal. I want to say clearly that I declare them illegal.

[Nosovets] Ruslam Imranovich, I would like to note...

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] This is one thing. I would like to say another thing. The other day we adopted a decision on the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. According to this decision, if the authorities take unconstitutional positions, citizens, collectives and public organizations have the right to hold a referendum. As a matter of fact, we have applied the same provisions which have been stipulated by the USSR Supreme Soviet. By its decisions, the USSR Supreme Soviet issued the following instruction: All right, if certain Union republics are against holding the Union referendum, we must give labor collectives the right to hold this referendum. In precisely the same way—and I agree with this, this is a good decision by the USSR Supreme Soviet, in my view—we adopted an absolutely identical decision regarding those bodies of power which are illegally trying to violate human rights. See for yourself, what can be more democratic than giving a citizen the chance to express his agreement or disagreement. But there are still some bodies and officials who imagine that they are absolute rulers, princes or, perhaps, khans or other kinds of small-time tsars and all of a sudden they deprive their compatriots of the right to express their will through a referendum. What is this? This is criminal! I simply do not know what our courts, our procurators, our much- vaunted KGB bodies are doing? Why are not they instituting criminal proceedings against such officials?

[Nosovets] Ruslan Imranovich, I would also like to clarify the point. After all, those soviets or presidiums of those soviets which have adopted decisions on not holding our referendum are, in essence, either a continuation of an oblast party committee plenum or the membership of an oblast committee or republican committee because all the representatives of party oligarchy, as a rule, have moved on to local soviets. It is now—this is my second point—that these structures are carrying out counter propaganda against our question on presidency. For example, leaders of the Omsk party organization have adopted a decision: Yes, they are in favor of presidency in Russia but only after a new constitution is adopted which will stipulate the president's powers. There are many examples of this kind.

[Khasbulatov] Well, you have asked a whole lot of questions in one go. To begin with, I would not like to come out firmly against all the oblast, kray and rayon party committes. In many oblast and rayon committees there are sober capable people, they understand the situation, they can somehow take into account the processes which are taking place in society today, and they really do try to take them into account. But in fact (?the problem) is different. There are still people who are clinging—for instance, the first secretary of some oblast or kray party comnmittee, or some republican committee, such as in Checheno-Ingushetia—they are clinging to their position, they have finally got into power and [passage indistinct].

Evidently he likes to carry out Polozkov's commands in this way. But let's leave him to his own devices. It is another matter when we are talking about the soviets. These are the organs of people's power, they are organs which are answerable to people, to their fellow citizens, and they must be directly responsible to people. So, of course, no one has the right to deprive anyone of the right to express his opinion, and anyone who hinders this right, in accordance with our law on the referendum,

bears very basic criminal responsibility, this must be understood; this really must be understood.

What you were saying about Omsk, and not only Omsk, is another matter. There are a few other oblast party committees which are simply hindering our work, which are simply waging a struggle against soviet power. They are openly waging a war, and so Boris Nikolayevich was quite right when he said that they are waging a war against us. It is not we who are waging the war, it is not we who are declaring war on anybody, but they are waging war against us. We have spoken about this many times. In the final analysis you have to understand the logic of life, the development of some democratic process, whether you want it or not, people want to be free. Why set up obstacles to people become free?

So, we evidently have to finish on this point. I very much want healthy forces in society to predominate, and there are very many clever people in the party, very serious and thoughtful people; the party has to be made healthier. I even think, you know, that perhaps we should create a parallel communist party. Whatever the case, such a party as Polozkov's party is a totally incomprehensible organization which has nothing to do with Marxism or Leninism, it is solely engaged in struggle, in war with Yeltsin. Let the whole country go to ruin—this, it seems to me, is how Polozkov's lot see it—let the whole country go to ruin, as long as Yeltsin is brought down and his regime is eliminated.

[Nosovets] The Russian Communist Party [RCP] is the only force which can accomplish any transformations.

[Khasbulatov] Well, look, the RCP again. The RCP is a kind of uniform force. I should think that 90 percent of the RCP are normal people. The leadership, those at the top, they are another matter, they have nothing in common. I repeat, they are completely incompetent people, they have nothing in common with Marx or Lenin, or communism, or socialism. These are people who have become accustomed to dominating over others, over society, trampling people, oppressing people, dominating, to establish a dictatorship, that is what they think, to hell with this Russia, let's destroy Yeltsin together, that's where our happiness lies. [indistinct interjection from Nosovets]

This is a dangerous affair. So I would like to call on our fellow citizens, our fellow countrymen, once again, because in fact there remain literally a few days before the referendum, to give it a lot of thought, we need normal power in Russia. Of course they reason like this: You correctly said that in Omsk, good, they are not against a president, but first we need a constitution, but it is interesting what the reasoning was when we were electing a president of the USSR.

[Nosovets] Was there full support?

[Khasbulatov] No. What was there? There was the Constitution, there were resolutions, it is ridiculous. Then there is the process in all the republics, I have even received a document from the president, with "to presidents of republics" written on it. It is a generally accepted thing, and the USSR president does not object to it, but here forces have come up which [words indistinct] any decision adopted by the Russian legislature. They have to be rejected. That is, when we say destructive forces, it is not the forces which speak out in some newspapers, at rallies; destructive forces means the bureaucracy, primarily the party bureaucracy, the bureaucracy in soviets, the economic bureaucracy, those who prevent us from effecting normal control of our Russian country, our Russian state. To put the very complicated and difficult life of our people in order—(?our people) live in very complicated conditions, very difficult conditions—I think that the election of a president, that is, of a head of the Russian state, is one way of putting things right in our life, it seems to me. I would like to say once again: I am not against the Union referendum. We were recently discussing the new Union treaty. I would like to [word indistinct] everyone that I spoke myself, I was first to speak, and I proposed that it be adopted as a working basis. True, we said that until we had a mandate from the congress—our congress is our supreme body here in Russia, and since the congress has not discussed it, we were in general against publishing this draft, but since the decision was adopted at the level of the Presidential Council, or rather, the level of the Federation Council and the president...

[Nosovets] But without Russia's participation...

[Khasbulatov] Why without our participation? I participated in it.

[Nosovets] Without Russia's agreement to publication.

[Khasbulatov] Not only Russia's, but Ukraine and Kazakhstan and other republics, too, objected to the publication of this document. Never mind, it has been published and that is that, I don't see anything terrible in this, it has to be discussed, there has to be some deep thinking and reflection. Of course we have to strive for a Union treaty, but what it should be like is another thing, isn't it? So we must [words indistinct] we must be able to seek agreement. I don't understand those people, those figures, especially those from the party leadership, who are trying to oppose the Russian referendum.

In conclusion, I greet our fellow citizens, and I ask them very earnestly to vote very solidly on polling day for our own Russian head of state to emerge here in Russia. Maybe it will help us; at any rate, I assure you, it won't do us any harm. So let's vote for these changes to our Constitution. Thank you.

Khasbulatov Comments on Yeltsin Speech, Treaty

LD1303201291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1230 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Interview with Ruslam Imranovich Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, supreme soviet, by Boris

Morkovnikov, Radio Rossii legislative correspondent; place, date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Morkovnikov] Ruslan Imranovich, in his latest speech, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin noted that the president has said that the republics are in agreement with at least nine tenths of the draft Union treaty which has been published. As leader of the Russian Federation's working group, you did not subscribe to these agreements. Could you tell me, where do the differences still remain? In what way is the president right, and where is he mistaken?

[Khasbulatov] Well you see, here I would like to introduce a specific clarification. The fact is that our comrades, including the congress commissions, members of the congress commissions, the chairmen of the chambers, and a large group of our comrades from the autonomous republics have been working on this draft law for a long time, along with representatives and specialists from the Union republics, including those at Morozovka [place outside Moscow where representatives met to discuss the draft Union treaty]. Although there are very many very complex problems in it, nevertheless, when our congress commission assembled—120 people—under the chairmanship of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, I spoke first and made a report, an account, and proposed adopting this document as a working basis. So, in our commission, we adopted this document as a working basis or foundation.

We attach great importance to this Union treaty, and Boris Nikolayevich and myself are, generally speaking, firm supporters of working out and signing a good Union treaty. However, despite that fact we spoke about very serious contraditons, in both the horizontal and vertical sense, between our autonomous entities and oblasts, and between the central bodies and the Union republics. But you know, in order to have some sort of constructive material, some sort of constructive basis, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and myself proposed accepting it as a working basis.

It is true to say that at the same time, the commission expressed itself in favor of not publishing it for discussion at our congress. this is what Boris Nikolayevich had in mind.

The Federation Council adopted a resolution to adopt the treaty as a basis and to publish it. Generally speaking, not only were we, not only was I opposed to this, but the Ukraine and Kazakhstan felt that we needed to work on it. What was the hurry? It needed to be properly discussed, and the precise position of the Supreme Soviet needed to be established. Whether the treaty is published or not, let the people look at it, study it, find out, and then express their views on it. Therefore, it is of course incorrect to accuse us of not signing the working version and so on. Therefore, I would like to use Radio Rossii to let this particular detail be known. Otherwise, people talk as if Yeltsin is speaking against the treaty, as if Khasbulatov is against it. This is just not the case. We have demonstrated our constructive attitude toward this document, and have approved it as a working basis.

But there is a difference between a basis and a working basis, isn't that right? For this reason, I believe that Boris Nikolayevich said that we did not adopt this document as a basis, but adopted it as a working basis. Incidentally, at the moment, very intensive work is going on within our commission. Our congress commission is very large—120 people. The commission has elected 20 people to be part of a working group for this commission, which is very seriously getting to grips with our working versions.

There are, however, many problems. It is strange to say, but I find myself in a somewhat delicate situation. Now, I would like to reveal all the most serious of these problems. I can do so in exactly two words. In the first place, we consider that the center is retaining too great an authority for itself to the detriment of the Union republics. The second thing is these vague joint powers, and you know what joint authority is? It always tends toward benefiting the strong. Then incidentally, there is very considerable alarm among the Union republics with regard to the fact that our autonomous republics will sign directly, not going through Russia. Moreover, it is interesting—and I have been speaking about this for many months—that the union republics are now standing in the defense of the RSFSR and for its preservation as a single state. The Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belorussia speak plainly and say: Please Comrades, you are taking matters to the point of bringing about the disintegration of Russia, which is what direct signing of the treaty by the main sections of the RSFSR means. Do you see what sort of problems there are? They are very serious ones.

Moreover, these same problems are raised by our deputies from the kray and oblast levels. Furthermore, suspicion of our autonomous republics has grown recently, following a whole series of republics refusing to hold the Russian referendum. Now people are writing, streams of letters are arriving, and people's deputies are speaking with great alarm about the fact that the autonomous republics already want to leave the RSFSR with all possible haste, without holding referenda, and without making changes to the constitution, but by means of this very Union treaty, and with all due speed, and this means the collapse of Russia. These are the very serious objections, very serious objections.

But on the whole, I hope that we will resolve these problems. I always put my faith in common sense, in the commonsense approach of our deputies. But the problems are very complex. I would not say that nine-tenths of them have been resolved. I think that it is exactly nine-tenths of these problems which remain unresolved.

[Morkovnikov] Ruslan Imranovich, as is well known, the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation has adopted a resolution, by which combining the positions of responsibility in the Communist Party and the soviets is forbidden. It is not difficult to understand why.

It is not their wish for the soviets to assume power and then once again hand it back to the party's state apparatus. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, said in his speech that if the obkom secretaries do not give up one of their two positions of responsiblity before 15 March, then as soon as 16 March, that is to say on the following day, the republic's procurator will institute criminal proceedings against every one of them. To what extent is that resolution of the Congress of People's Deputies legal? I am asking you, because Lazarev, deputy chairman of the Constitutional Supervision Committee at the Union legislative session, recently stated that this decision by the Russian people's deputies is illegal as it infringes upon human rights. Your view on this?

[Khasbulatov] Comrade Lazarev is clearly just poorly acquainted with constitutional rights. I believe that it would be better were he not to hold such a high post. The fact of the matter is that that Constitutional Supervision Committee does not have the right to interfere in the affairs if the Union Republic's Supreme Soviets, and even more so in the affairs of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies—neither to comment upon nor interpret. At best, they might be able to propose something to us, but it is an illegal decision to try and change a Supreme Soviet resolution. It is already time to call to account those responsible for this. It would be better if Comrade Lazarev were to occupy himself with the USSR Supreme Soviet law of 26 April 1990, which is anticonstitutional in its content, and which recognizes the Union republics and autonomous republics as being subjects of the USSR, by which the start of a parade of sovereignty has been set down, and by which the beginnings of the collapse of the Russian state are set down. This anticonstitutional law of the USSR Supreme Soviet—let comrade Lazarev and comrade Alekseyev get to work on this law. They are trying to teach us what we should do. We have lawyers here who are no worse than comrade Alekseyev or comrade Lazarev, and we know the law perfectly well and what we should be doing.

Generally speaking, I support the view that we should call a session of the Supreme Soviet, without the procurator, and get rid of those people who combine these posts. That is how I would act, to be frank.

[Morkovnikov] But all the same, [words indistinct].

[Khasbulatov] It is even impossible to go on any more, because these comrades have literally declared war on the Russian Supreme Soviet and on the Russian Government. They are not subordinate to our laws. Polozkov is in charge of these characters. Can we be reconciled with them, can our fellow citizens be reconciled? Take a look: now they have declared open war on our referendum: the emissaries of Comrade Polozkov are setting off all over the place and the local soviets are agitating everywhere so that people will not go to vote on the referendum. Well, that is anticonstitutional activity. Why is Comrade Lazarev not interested in this anticonstitutional activity by some party bodies? That is what is appropriate to ask.

But taking this opportunity, I call upon all our Russian fellow citizens to take part in the referendum on the 17th. Where the authorities have said that it is supposedly not taking place, then let our fellow citizens know that this decision is unconstitutional and illegal. To deprive citizens of the right to take part in a referendum, to express their ideas, should be stopped by our criminal law; and let citizens apply to the courts, the procurator's office, and phone us in the judicial department and give us information. We will deal with those comrades and with those leaders who adopt anticonstitutional and antistate resolutions with all the force of our law.

[Morkovnikov] Thank you, Ruslan Imranovich.

Procurator: No Prosecution for Combining Posts

LD1303235991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Interview with Valentin Stepankov, procurator general of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, by correspondent Aleksandr Kraminov; place, date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] Valentin Georgiyevich Stepankov, procurator general of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], has granted an interview to our correspondent Aleksandr Kraminov. The topic of the conversation was the tasks posed by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, for the republican Procuracy in his speech at the House of Theater.

[Kraminov] I will quote to remind viewers: In Russia those who combine the leadership of soviets with the leadership of oblast and rayon party committees have until 15 March to make a choice, and, on 16 March a case will be brought by the procurator against each one. They don't yet believe this. Well what is to happen?

[Stepankov] Well, here, I think we all need to remember the decision by the first Congress of Russian People's Deputies last year. A discussion on the question of combining state posts with others in political and public organizations took place at the congress. Russian deputies said that there should be no such combining of posts on the territory of Russia. But the process was not completed, and, in this connection, in January 1991, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decision providing a mechanism for resolving the question when the situation is already protracted. It was envisaged that a higher session of the local soviet could resolve the question of the dismissal of such an official if he continues to combine posts up to 15 March. That is how the time limit appeared.

What action will the organs of the RSFSR Procuracy take? We are obliged to ensure the implementation of the

decision by our supreme organ of power, the congress, even if it means using procuratorial supervision.

[Kraminov] That is clear. But it also says here that a case will be brought. In accordance with which article or... I don't know.

[Stepankov] Well, the most likely thing is that there is some kind of mistake in the actual legal formulations that Boris Nikolayevich used, since there is, at the moment, no question of bringing criminal cases or taking administrative proceedings over this situation. We have other forms and methods of procuratorial supervision to draw attention to and to require an end to the violations I have mentioned.

[Kraminov] In the same speech, Boris Nikolayevich posed the question of creating a Democratic Party, a broad democratic party. So this law, in that case, will also affect the people who will lead the party?

[Stepankov] I think that the law and the decision adopted by the first congress cannot be literally interpreted in that way—the CPSU and combining posts in the soviets. It is a question, in general of political activity in any sociopolitical organizations.

Prokofyev Sees No Need for RSFSR President

LD1303222891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent V. Stepanyuk, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Moscow Communists and the Referendum - that was the topic of today's news conference given by Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofev, member of the Politburo and leader of the capital's party organization.

[Stepanyuk] According to preliminary polls conducted by Soviet and U.S. sociologists, 65-70 percent of Muscovites will take part in the referendum. Approximately the same percentage of those coming to vote will say "yes" to a future renewed union. A quarter of those voting in the capital intend to say "no" to the main question of the referendum. Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev said that during these days Moscow communists are meeting collectives of enterprises, writing articles and speaking in primary party organizations to explain their position by stressing that only a positive solution to the problem of a united union will be able to save the country from disintegration.

[Begin Prokofyev recording] I cannot speak for all Moscow communists, as I do not know everyone's point of view—we did not conduct a referendum among communists. But the research work and the meetings we held show that the majority of Moscow communists support the idea of preserving the Union, and that means that they will say "yes". [end recording]

[Stepanyuk] Soviet and foreign journalists asked Prokofyev a lot of questions as regards the Russian referendum.

[Begin Prokofyev recording] As regards the Russian referendum, once again I cannot speak for all Moscow communists, but my position is as follows: Russia does not need a president. Maybe here I would hurt some of our Union republics, but in principle I believe that if we want to have the Union, probably one president is enough, and republics should have chairmen of supreme soviets. I do not think that the more presidents there are, the more order there will be, but there will be more personal political ambitions and the republics that will enter this federation will be further away from each other. Our sociological research in Moscow showed that about 40 percent believe that a presidency in Russia will not change anything and they will not be living better; 28 percent of people have not determined their position yet; and only the remainder believe there is any point in introducing a presidency in Russia as there are similar examples in other republics. [end recording]

Prosecutor Says Yeltsin Remarks 'Inaccurate'

LD1303230891 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] The new prosecutor general of the Russian Federation, 39-year-old (Valentin Stepankov), has begun executing his duties. When meeting with newsmen on Tuesday, he said the main principles of his work will be protecting human rights and strict compliance with the laws of the republic and of the Union.

He described as an inaccurate wording the recent statement by the chairman of the parliament of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, that the prosecutor will file suit with those who, after the 15th March, will continue to hold both party and governing posts. What is really meant is only drawing the attention of the local governing bodies by the prosecutor's office to such combining of posts being incompatible.

'Union of Russian Cities' Created in Moscow

LD1403044691 Moscow TASS in English 1844 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—A meeting of mayors of over 50 industrial Russian cities ended today in Moscow by forming a Union of Russian Cities.

The union will work out a single policy as regards municipal property, social security and taxes.

It also intends to press for a transfer of some administrative functions from ministries and regional councils to city authorities.

The mayors adopted the union's charter and elected its governing bodies. Valeriy Ryumin, the mayor of Ryazan (central Russia) was elected president of the union.

The union's executive directorate will have its headquarters in Moscow.

Leningrad's Sobchak Meets With ROK President

LD1203233691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Mar 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] No Tae-u, president of the Republic of Korea, received Anatoliy Sobchak, Leningrad Soviet chairman, who was in Seoul. In the course of the conversation, No Tae-u confirmed his support for the policy of perestroyka in the USSR. He spoke out in favor of further developing Soviet-South Korean ties in all spheres, including economic cooperation.

Western Republics

Belorussian Televised Legislature Debates End

PM1203125991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Commentary by correspondent N. Matukovskiy: "The Legislature Off Screen"]

[Text] There has been an event in the Belorussian legislature that immediately attracted attention and prompted a wave of highly contradictory opinions and rumors. The legislature has decided to end live television and radio broadcasts of its proceedings. Henceforth, there will only be brief POSTFACTUM reports and accounts in the newspapers. The people have been quick to respond: "The legislature has joined the partisan underground."

It could not be called an unexpected event: It has been written and talked about for a long time. Particularly by voters. Here are some brief but categorical lines from their letters: "I am tired of your speculative performances at the microphone!" (G. Volynets, Grodno); "I find it offensive to see and hear what goes on in the auditorium" (A. Shur, Brest); "It is a striptease show put on by deputies—there is no other word for it" (V. Zuyev, Novopolotsk); "When you listen to the 'gentlemen' deputies, you cannot believe that they are people's deputies!" (P. Mashirov, Mogilev). And these are not even the most strongly worded expressions. The secretaries cannot bring themselves to show many of the letters to the supreme soviet leadership. Because of these "strongly worded expressions." It is certainly true that some people just cannot be kept quiet.

But is this harsh assessment fair? Is this abrupt swing away from universal euphoria for the democratically elected legislature to such deafening criticism of it logical? It seems that it is all both fair and logical.

When you begin to read these letters more closely, you realize that their authors are scandalized not by the actual fact of broadcasting but by what they see and hear. It is not HOW but WHAT that upsets them. They could forgive harmless "play for the microphone" if this "play" were to get down to the nitty-gritty and be concerned with solving the major, urgent problems on which our time is so generously spent. Unfortunately....

Some voters began to feel mistrustful of the legislature when it started to outline its program for the immediate future and define its political "image".... Who is in favor of discussing the question of possible recognition for the "Rebirth" Belorussian People's Front in Support of Perestroyka—BPF? (Not recognize, just discuss!). The overwhelming majority were against. Who is in favor of people's right to obtain reliable information? The result: 51 for and 181 against. Who is in favor of making changes to the Law on Elections? The result: 35 for and 265 against.

These last two figures represent the "image" of the republic legislature, two-thirds of which consists of party, soviet, and economic leaders. Having won in the elections, they are completely satisfied with the electoral law and can find no imperfections in it. It is thanks to this law, however, that 15 people's deputies have still not been elected to the legislature. Voters have stopped going to elections, which is something that did not happen even in the stagnation era, when all deputies were selected from above and the people simply dropped their papers with the names of the "appointees" into the ballot boxes. The election campaign was more democratic this time, however, and many of those whom the people really wanted to elect have in fact been elected to the legislature.

Far be it from me to paint a black picture of the legislature. It has a very great many honest, decent, principled people, thanks to whom the legislature has been able to adopt decisions essential to the people: on sovereignty for the republic, social protection for the victims of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant, and others.

Why then is the supreme soviet receiving not hundreds but thousands of angry letters from voters? The fact is that (so far, at least) they have not seen a normal struggle of opinions: Instead, they see confrontation for the sake of confrontation, "all-out warfare," and a dialogue of the "deaf." There is always an opposition in any civilized legislature. The opposition forces the legislative majority to "behave" and propose the most convincing, cogent drafts that it, the opposition, cannot fault.

In the Belorussian legislature, however, everything is the other way around: Rather than try to prove and argue their own program and opinions, deputies endeavor to crush the program and opinions of their "opponent"—using any means to do so. All are lacking in real—as opposed to feigned—legislative respect. For example, People's Deputy A. Sloboda had this to say about opposition deputies in NARODNAYA GAZETA: "Concerted performances by opposition deputies that would be more appropriate to a rally have become a source of

great concern in parliament recently. These deputies fling mud at the CPSU. Smart alecks like Borshchevskiy and Poznyak should know that the Hitlers and Goebbels do not come from the weakened administration running the country and the republic but from the rally-mad, populist, anarchist mob in the streets riding the wave of demagoguery and lies." So many colors and nuances in just one sentence! What arguments! Hitler, Goebbels, anarchy, demagoguery, lies, and populism....

In exactly the same way, the "opposition" is not sparing in its use of colorful language when trying to beat its "opponent." As a result, its extremely reasonable proposals sometimes do not get through simply because they are couched in unacceptable language. This is a very great shame. After all, both sides essentially want the same thing: To see their people live a normal life. Only the ways and means they propose to achieve this are different. Is it really necessary to tear each other apart over a difference of opinion?

This militant confrontation in the legislature gives rise to the same kind of confrontation in society. The legislature and the people are communicating vessels which have direct, mutual influence on one another. If the legislative majority, to which A. Sloboda belongs, believes that the opposition—that troublemaker, the Belorussian People's Front—is the source of all evil, the voters believe exactly the same. Some of their letters are really terrible to read: "They should be shot," "thrown in jail," "driven out with a garbage broom," "recalled".... All this is aimed at the opposition, which is expected to make the legislative majority behave "sportingly." So, it's "long live conformity!" is it? Has time really taught us nothing? It is true that the voter may not always find it easy to understand the intricacies of our contemporary political and economic life. But the legislature must be a model in every respect. It must set an example of wisdom, tolerance of different trends of thought, and respect for the individual—qualities in which all of us are lacking at present. Or should it all be put down to a lack of experience and legislative professionalism? Well, time will tell. Perhaps "going underground" will be of some benefit. Perhaps the microphone really is an impediment and a provocation....

New Draft Law Affects Belorussian Militia

Rights, Protections Guaranteed

PM2802100091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 91 Second Edition p 1

[BELTA-TASS report under the "Round and About" rubric: "The Right to Risk"]

[Text] Belorussian guardians of order have obtained the right to justified professional risk. This new position of principle has been included in the law "On the Militia" that has been adopted by the republic's supreme soviet.

According to the law, militia workers in Belorussia are not bound by the decisions of political parties or mass social movements and may not be involved in sociopolitical activity while on duty.

In the social sphere the law provides for compulsory life insurance for the militia worker and substantial financial compensation for the family in the event of his death and for the worker himself for wounds received and bodily harm.

A sum of 100 million rubles will be spent on implementing the law.

Raises Turned Down

LD0103093991 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 1 Mar 91

[Text] Another item from the Novosti news agency.

Belorussian militiamen almost came into the category of the highest paid persons in the republic. While discussing a draft law on the militia in legislature, most deputies inclined to the view that the pay of militia staff should be legislatively increased by between 50 percent and 100 percent. The opposition insisted on this more vigorously than anyone else.

After a group of militia deputies and communists refused to adopt an article depoliticizing internal affairs organs, the opposition categorically declared that, in that case, let the Belorussian Communist Party raise the pay of its militia from the party budget.

As a result, the militiamen have retained their party cards and previous wages.

The other 45 articles of the new law were adopted without any particular arguments.

Former Belorussian Defense Enterprise Converted

LD0103112991 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0515 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Summary] Rikon, a state small scientific and creative foreign trade enterprise, has started to function at the Izmeritel Novopolotsk factory, which has for a long time been a military enterprise. Rikon, which makes the technology and the products of this factory accessible to civil customers, is now developing contacts with foreign companies. For instance, a British company is going to test an Izmeritel navigation satellite installation, Shkiper, on ships in Britain. If the test proves successful, it is prepared to sign a big contract with Rikon. China has also shown interest in the installation.

Another product of Izmeritel, transducers, are also being advertised by Rikon.

Army Role in Referendum Questioned in Moldova

Union Official: Serves as 'Organizer'

LD1303214291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 13 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Demibetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev, 13 Mar (TASS)—The army is not trying to destabilize the situation in Moldova. It is not therefore intending to assume the role of organizer of the nationwide referendum. This was stated by A. Kruchin, chairman of the commission for holding the referendum in Odessa Military District, at a meeting here with journalists.

In accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet decision of 25 February which granted work collectives and public organizations the right to hold a plebiscite separately, a referendum will be organized on the territory of military units and establishments. Since it could complicate service duties it has been decided to hold the plebiscite from 14 to 17 March at a time convenient for the units and subunits. In all, the military have set up 50 polling booths in the republic, including seven in Kishinev. A. Kruchin noted that steps have been taken to insure order on these days. If, on these days, anyone wants to visit our establishments and military units, there will not, I think, be any objections on the part of the commanders.

A report on this topic by the MOLDOVA-PRES news agency emphasizes that the actions of the military are at variance with acts of the Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic parliament, which on 19 February adopted a decision on not holding a referendum on the future of the USSR within the republic's territory.

More Troops Seen on Eve of Vote

PM1303214191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Mar 91 p 1

[MOLDOVA-PRESS report under the general heading: "Moldova: Exercise Pegged to Referendum?"]

[Text] According to a report by Dumitru Tsyga, press secretary to the president of the Republic of Moldova, as of 1100 hours on 13 March, additional military formations numbering approximately 360 men armed with submachine guns in trucks and armored personnel carriers had been stationed in 15 rayon centers. Commanders of military units everywhere are taking vigorous measures to hold the referendum. In official letters addressed to chairmen of local soviets, garrison chiefs hold local organs of power entirely responsible for possible disturbances.

According to a report from competent organs, a field staff with the corresponding communications equipment has been set up in the city of Yedintsy in the north of Moldova. There are also data that a mass mobilization of reservists will be conducted in the republic in order to oblige them, under conditions of field exercises, to participate in the holding of the Union referendum 16-17 March.

During the night of 13 March a column of approximately 50 armored personnel carriers and 100 GAZ-66's traveled from Tiraspol toward the city of Drokiya. There are servicemen armed with submachine guns in all the vehicles. The republic military commissariat claims that planned [planovyye] exercises are being held on the territory of Odessa Military District, and the said equipment and servicemen have been attached to military commissariats for the duration of the exercises. It was not possible to obtain any other information from them.

People's Front Blocks Polling Station in Moldova

LD1403143191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 14 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 14 Mar (TASS)—At 0800 Moscow time this morning, two polling stations on the grounds of the "Schetmash" production association in the Moldovan capital were opened, one for workers of the thousands-strong collective of the enterprise, and the other for the inhabitants of nearby districts. Until 1200 Moscow time, the polling stations were working normally.

At 1215, supporters of the Moldova People's Front blocked the entrance to the polling station designated for the inhabitants of nearby districts and tried to incite arriving voters to cause disturbances. To prevent them, the public organizations of the enterprise decided to temporarily close the polling station. By that time, 1,276 persons had managed to vote "yes" to the new Union.

At the republican military commandant's office, the TASS correspondent was told that all 50 polling stations for servicemen to cast their vote had opened early this morning.

Apart from servicemen and members of their families, quite a few civilians who had not had an opportunity to express their attitude to the Union treaty in their own districts and establishments came to the ballot boxes in the military units.

The newspaper SFATUL CERII today publishes a statement by the Supreme Soviet of the Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. In the statement, voting in military units, military commissariats, frontier posts, and at enterprises of Union significance is regarded as interference in the internal affairs of the republic and infringement of its sovereignty. In the opinion of the authors of the statement, all this not only contravenes the decisions adopted by the republic's legislature, but also creates grounds for falsification, rigging, and direct deception. Therefore the results of a referendum held in such conditions cannot be acknowledged as the declared will of the people, or even any part of the people.

The statement affirms "people coming out against the legitimate decisions of the legislature of Moldova are provoking political instability, social tension, and artificial confrontation of various groups of the population." The presidium levelled particularly sharp criticism against the Tiraspol Joint Council of Labor collectives, which at the beginning of March appealed to all citizens of the republic to take the most active part in preparations for holding the referendum.

Moldovan Communist Party Head Discusses Poll

PM1403101791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Grigoriy Yeremey, first secretary of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee, by correspondent A. Pasechnik; place and date not given; under the rubric "Every Person Decides Country's Fate; Eight Days Left to All-Union Referendum": "Communists Favor Union"]

[Text] Kishinev City—A Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee plenum has considered the question "On the Current Moment." This moment, in short, is characterized by one main feature—an acute complication of the sociopolitical situation on the eve of the all-Union referendum. What did the republic's communist headquarters decide? This is what our brief conversation with G. Yeremey, first secretary of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee, is about.

[Pasechnik] Why, Grigoriy Isidorovich, did the referendum question arise again at the Central Committee plenum? After all, the previous plenum and then the republic party conference stated unequivocally that communists favor the referendum.

[Yeremey] Sure, they made an unequivocal statement, but note how our agenda is expressed: "On the Current Moment." The situation has changed—that is the whole point. In recent weeks, even days, there has been a sharp increase in crisis phenomena in the republic. National income is falling and inflation is rising, hitting people's living standard hard. Destructive forces calling themselves democratic forces are busily whipping up anticommunist hysteria, anti-Sovietism, and separatism. On top of it all a deep government crisis has also broken out which has ended for the time being with the transfer of all executive and administrative powers to the republic president. It should be noted that communists actively support him.

The situation has been exacerbated by the well-known decision of our legislature, which urged abstention from holding a nationwide referendum in the Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] on the question of preserving the Union. This act provoked a highly equivocal reaction in the republic. Going against documents of the country's Supreme Soviet, it intensifies the notorious "war of laws."

Let us ponder whether something completely intolerable for a civilized country is going on: Despite claims to be speaking on their behalf, the people are, at the same time, seemingly being pushed aside; yet they are the supreme repository of state power. Of course, it is possible to discuss wordings of one kind or another, to dispute, to make things more precise. But before building a bridge it is necessary to decide whether or not to build it, and only later discuss what sort of bridge it will be. Just like here.

So, returning to the said question, at the plenum we reaffirmed our adherence to our previous decisions and, at the same time, noted in the adopted declaration that we favor immediately adopting the Moldovan SSR law on the referendum and ensuring the free expression of the people's will. We remain committed to the idea of a renewed Union of sovereign states.

[Pasechnik] That is the strategy of Moldovan Communists. What about tactics?

[Yeremey] We are currently just as concerned about tactics as strategy. Look at what is happening. The word "abstain" appears in legislature's decision on the referendum, but in recent days quite different and much tougher wordings have started being voiced from the same government's platform, by government bodies, and on national radio and television. They are switching from words to specific actions. It does not behoove communists to yield to this onslaught. What is more we do not intend to do that. On the other hand, we firmly refute the accusations that have recently appeared that the Communist Party is apparently organizing work for the referendum. First, in the places where such work is being carried out, it is being organized exclusively by those authorized to do so by law—the local soviets. It is not for us law-abiding people to supplant them. This was confirmed by us in the plenum declaration. Second, the Moldovan Communist Party consistently and persistently favors consolidation of society in our sovereign Moldova.

Our tactics, worked out at the plenum after stormy—it must be noted—debates, stem from all this. Where the local soviets unequivocally decided to hold a referendum, party committees are supporting them in this. In areas where sessions rejected the referendum, we are conducting explanatory work in primary organizations and labor collectives. We are explaining communists' position to people, citing the reasons for preserving a renewed Union, and debating. Let the people decide for themselves.

Sociologists Survey Opinions in Moldova

LD1203102691 Moscow TASS in English 0913 GMT 12 Mar 91

[By Moldova-PRES and TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev March 12 TASS—Moldova now has a public opinion survey centre of its own. A branch of the all-Union Public Opinion Survey Centre supervised by prominent sociologist, USSR People's Deputy Tatyana Zaslavskaya, opened here.

The theme of the first sociological survey was "1990-1991. Realities and expectations". It was conducted by specialists of the branch in Kishinev and Beltsiy, as well as in a number of large districts in Moldova. More than 1,000 people were polled. Respondents reflected demographic, national and social composition of the republic's population.

Sociologists assert that people are concerned with sociopolitical and economic processes taking place in the USSR and in Moldova. Virtually every second person polled (46.2 percent) answered that if only he or she knew in 1985 where the changes would lead, support from them would be withdrawn.

The survey shows that supporters of perestroyka get discouraged by daily problems. Asked what gives particular concern, respondents were divided according to their nationality. Price rises and the erosion of living standards are particularly dishearting for Moldova's native population (58.3 percent), while ethnic conflict rates second (41.5 percent). Meanwhile the russian-speaking population is most anxious over ethnic problems (71 percent), regarding the erosion of living standrads as an evil (45 percent).

Still people in Moldova also had joys. They were pleased with the rebirth of national culture and spiritual life (42.1 percent). With every second Moldovan polled this joy was shared by 15 percent of Russians, 20.2 percent of Ukrainians, 36.8 percent of Gagauz, 46.2 percent of Bulgarians.

People were also heartened by the consolidation of Moldova's sovereignty and independence (24.5 percent), by the fact that the Soviet Communist Party voluntarily renounced the monopoly on power (21 percent) and democratic elections (16.2 percent).

Railroad Workers Threaten Mine Countermeasures

LD1403164191 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] The representatives of work collectives of Krasnoyarmeysk Vuzhvah of Donetsk railway have expressed their alarm and anxiety in connection with the strike of Donetsk miners. The stop of coal deliveries has caused material losses to the railway workers' collectives. They have warned the miners that all agreements concluded earlier with these associations will be broken off and transport service for them will be stopped completely if the pits of Krasnoyarmeysk and other regions served by the Donetsk railway do not resume work in 48 hours. The train engines and staff will be taken away from the access tracks of the mines on strike and sent to do other work.

Ukrainians Hear Opposing Views on Referendum

LD1303233391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2137 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent M. Khyazhnitskiy, from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Announcer] Opposition parties in the Ukraine have expresed their negative attitude to the coming referendum. But here is a more detailed report on the attitudes of Ukrainians in this regard.

[Khyazhnitskiy] As you know, along with the all-Union referendum in the Ukraine there will also be a republic-wide public opinion poll. The poll is formulated as follows: Do you agree that the Ukraine should be a part of a Union of Soviet Sovereign States on the basis of the declaration on the Ukraine's state sovereignty?

It is difficult to forecast the results. The opposition is already divided. Most members of Rukh are calling for a yes reply to the republican question. At republican party rallies there have been calls to write the word no on both the Union and the republican ballot slips. Radicals consider that the Ukraine should not be part of the Union. The majority both of the communists and the opposition have expressed support for being a part of the Union on the basis of the declaration on sovereignty.

A conference was held in Kiev today on the issue of the referendum. Representatives of various parties and persuasions ranging from republicans, democrats, and Greens to the Komsomol expressed their views. It seems that the consolidation proclaimed by Supreme Soviet chairman Kravchuk will become a reality.

Representatives of foreign television companies who are now in the Ukraine are saying that it is interesting for them here, since the attitudes of most of the politicians in the republic toward the referendum may be described as sensible and free of any extremism.

It only remains for Kiev's inhabitants to ponder on whom to believe: The pamphlets issued by Rukh that say no to the Union referendum and attempt to persuade one that in the production of the main kinds of output the Ukraine is among the leaders in Europe; or the enormous slogans in the city center which claim that the disintegration of the Union will lead to further destabilization in our country.

Ukraine Oblasts Add Questions to Referendum

LD1403041291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0500 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Text] A third voting paper is already being prepared for the forthcoming referendum, in the Ukraine. Apart from the Union-wide paper, the republican Supreme Soviet has, you will recall, established a second one, asking citizens to answer a question as to whether they agree that the Ukraine should be part of a Union of sovereign states on the basis of the declaration on the republic's

state sovereignty. A joint decision has also been made by three soviets—Lvov, Ivano-Frankovsk, and Ternospol oblasts—on organizing a third voting paper for the referendum, in which citizens are asked whether they want the Ukraine to be a totally independent state.

Gen Gromov Sues Paper Over Coup Allegations

PM0603162991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Sergey Tsikora: "General Sues Newspaper"]

[Text] Kiev—Colonel General B. Gromov has brought a suit against the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA, published in the Ukraine in a print run of 1 million.

In September last year it published an interview with USSR People's Deputy Colonel V. Martirosyan who, speaking of the possibility of a military coup in our country, mentioned those who might take part in it, including Colonel General B. Gromov, then commander of the Kiev Military District. The general considered this mention to be an encroachment on his honor and dignity and has brought a suit against Martirosyan, the author of the interview, and the newspaper.

The plaintiff has assigned the defense of his interests to his representatives. At their latest session the sides gave each other a kind of Russian language examination, even bringing into the legal proceedings V. Dal, according to whose renowned dictionary they determined what KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA had actually published: "reports," unchecked by the editorial office, of the possibility of a military coup, or simply V. Martirosyan's "opinion," voiced as a political forecast? Alas, the verbal battle did not reveal a winner. The next court hearing—the fifth—of the general's complaint is scheduled for the middle of March.

Radiation Monitoring System Developed in Ukraine

PM1203155591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent V. Lyaskalo in Kiev; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Lyaskalo] A.A. Klyuchnikov, director of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Nuclear Research Institute's Special Technological Design Bureau, is showing new radiometers, some of which are ready for series production now and others of which are a longer-term proposition, to leaders of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and simultaneously to us.

[Klyuchnikov, director of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Nuclear Research Institute's Special Technological Design Bureau] Our design bureau has been working on the development of special radiation monitoring systems for a long time, for military purposes, naturally. At least this was the case until recently.

At present, we have somewhat changed this tradition, and what you see on the table here are instruments which any citizen of the Soviet Union can use, and naturally above all those citizens who live in areas which were affected by the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station. With the help of these instruments they can measure not only the gamma background but also food and clothing contamination, resolve all sorts of municipal service tasks, monitor contamination in farmyards....

[Lyaskalo] That is soil contamination. What about water?

[Klyuchnikov] Monitor water contamination, of course.

[V.P. Kukhar, vice president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences] We know a great deal today about the tragedy in the Chelyabinsk area and about the Semipalatinsk test range. Most probably there are also other contaminated areas. These problems have to be resolved jointly, in a single state. In conditions of present-day life, competition in scientific research is very important, and it will most probably develop if a multitude of scientific organizations work independently of each other.

On the other hand, we understand that these problems can be resolved only in a joint effort. We are resolving these problems for the whole of the Union, and with the assistance of the whole of the Union, and most probably it will be necessary in scientific research to continue this policy and tactics.

Caucasus

Armenian Deputy Rejects Lukyanov Poll Appeal

NC1403003291 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 12 Mar 91

[Text] Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has sent an appeal to USSR People's Deputy Sero Khanzadyan. The appeal says: At the recommendation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I appeal to you to provide comprehensive assistance in connection with the holding of the referendum on 17 March on the preservation of the USSR. In this connection, special attention must be given to strict adherence to the legislation which ensures the expression of the citizens' free will.

In his reply to Lukyanov, Sero Khanzadyan states: I have received the cable you sent to me at the recommendation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I reject your request. Your decision [on the referendum] contradicts the peoples' right to free self-determination. You are trying to preserve the despotic empire which has caused, and is causing, enormous losses to the Armenian people and Armenia. You are denying the autonomy of the autonomous oblasts. You are keeping one nation under the domination of another nation. You are depriving the autonomous formations of their rights to a genuinely free and autonomous existence.

I demand that you put an end to the massacres of the Armenians in the Armenian Nagorno-Karabakh, restore the legal organs of power in the oblast, and withdraw your and Azerbaijan's armed detachments from the oblast immediately. Your appeal is immoral. The Armenian people will decide their destiny themselves by voting yes on 21 September to the following question on our referendum: Do you agree that Armenia should become an independent democratic republic outside the structure of the Soviet Union?

Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Criticizes Referendum

NC0103193391 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 28 Feb 91

[Excerpts] This is the third anniversary of the Sumgait tragedy. Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, chaired the morning session [of the Armenian Supreme Soviet] and said that Sumgait was a tragedy not only for our own nation and people but also for the Soviet Union. [passage omitted] By refusing to make a political assessment of that tragedy and by letting the criminals go unpunished, the Soviet leadership in effect encouraged all sorts of new atrocities and bloodshed. [passage omitted] The deputies then observed a minute's silence in memory of the victims of Sumgait.

Next, the session continued the political debate which had started yesterday on the government's record over the last seven months, its [word indistinct] and shortcomings, the Union treaty, and the Union and republican referendums. [passage omitted]

Then, Levon Ter-Petrosyan summed up the two days of debate. Following is his speech in full:

[Begin recording] [passage omitted] Now as regards the concretely posed problems: The first is the Union referendum. I think that the Union referendum, which is being strongly supported by the center and all the reactionary forces which want to maintain the totalitarian system of the country, is not a legal act but is purely propagandistic. This must be clear. It is not a legal act, and even the organizers of this referendum realize that a decision passed by one-quarter of the population cannot have legal force. [passage omitted] This is a clear violation of the people's right to self-determination in view of the fact that the republics are not deciding their fate but that instead it is the Union which is deciding their fate. This is cynicism on the part of those who (?speak) from the position of power.

The second issue is the Union treaty. [words indistinct] That treaty, in the form it has been drafted, is utopian and again a manifestation of cynicism because it does not emanate from the present conditions. [passage indistinct] That draft demands the republics forgo all their gains. This is illogical. No republic will forgo that which it has gained in these last two or three years. [passage omitted] The Union must be dismantled, I am not saying demolished, in a very natural and civilized manner and transformed into normal cooperation between peoples, such as the cooperation existing between Europeans. [passage omitted]

This is only our ideal, however, and we, being a state, republic, and government, must have our own present political program and policies which would take us nearer to this ideal. Among these possible policies one could think of the temporary lateral agreements between the union republics; we might also be forced to sign vertical agreements. [passage omitted] I again repeat: We might have aspirations and a clear political line, but we should not be euphoric. It cannot be dismissed that we might even be forced to sign the Union treaty. [passage omitted] If such a treaty were imposed on us, or if we are forced to sign such an agreement, then we must do everything to obtain as much advantage as possible. [words indistinct] [end recording] [passage omitted]

Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Views Current Issues

Urges Vote for Secession

PM1303154391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by G. Ovcharenko under the rubric "Well, Well, Well!": "Stick and Carrot"]

[Text] No, certain people have lately been confusing the new breed of democratic leaders, as they have publicly proclaimed themselves, with dictators who are unpopular with the masses. What is democracy, after all? Basically, it is a choice that everyone makes for himself. Democrats grant this right on a broad basis.

The latest example of this is Sunday's appearance on republican television by Z. Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, specifically aimed at the non-Georgian population. Incidentally, many mass media have accused Zviad Konstantinovich of, to put it mildly, putting the squeeze on the non-Georgian population. Even wanting to expel them from the republic....

This is all rubbish, apparently. As a true democrat, Z. Gamsakhurdia gives people of all nationalities a chance. They only have to make a choice: Vote for the restoration of Georgian state independence (that is, for its secession from the USSR—G. Ovcharenko) at the 31 March republic referendum and you get not only citizenship of it, but the right to own land. If you do not vote for it—alas.... It is entirely up to you—it is your fault if you are left without citizenship and without land. Democratic? According to Zviad Konstantinovich—totally!

Some questions do arise, though. For example, the referendum vote is secret—so how do you decide who was for an independent Georgia and who was against? But again the chairman of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet found a democratic solution: The establishment of a respondent's loyalty will depend on the overall result of voting in the rayons where there is a high

percentage of non-Georgians. So if you want to be a citizen of the republic and enjoy all the rights of a citizen, not only must you yourself vote in favor on 31 March, but also keep tabs on everyone else, so that there is no pluralism, God forbid.

Or the following question: What if, before 31 March, someone expresses his view of a renewed Union of sovereign republics at the Union referendum on 17 March, a positive view what is more?

Here, frankly, the chairman of the Georgian legislature blundered and failed, as a democrat, to find a pluralist response. He positively bellowed, like a dictator: Anyone who participates in the all-Union referendum is a traitor to Georgia. Traitors, as you will appreciate, are a special case—this is where the stick comes in.

As I write this rejoinder, I wonder: Perhaps those who see the traits of a nationalist dictator in democrat Z. Gamsakhurdia's actions are not that wrong after all?

Seeks End to Republic Conflicts

NC1403003391 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 12 Mar 91

[Text] At a news conference on 9 March, Zviyad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, said that fronts have been set up in Tshkinvali and Abkhazia which are working to bring about military intervention in Georgia and to deal a crushing blow to the national liberation struggle. Gamsakhurdia said: We have appealed to the Armenians living in Abkhazia and told them that if they take part in the formation of the front there, this will be double treachery, against both Armenia and Georgia, in view of the fact that Armenia, too, is not taking part in the Union referendum.

He also referred to Georgia's relations with Armenia and Azerbaijan, saying: We do not want to interfere in the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia, despite the fact my statement to the effect that Nagorno-Karabakh belongs to Armenia has been published in HAYASTANI HANRAPETUTYUN. This statement was made some time ago; I do not want to interfere in the problem now, for this would only complicate matters. I cannot take such a position now.

As regards relations between us and Armenia, they will be goodneighborly if the Armenian population in Georgia does not oppose our legislature and national movement. Nowadays, we are receiving unpleasant news from Bogdanovskiy, where they do not want to accept the prefect we appointed. They want to appoint the prefect themselves. That is a declaration of autonomy. We have appealed to Mr. Levon Ter-Petrosyan to intervene in this issue. Our laws, the laws adopted by the legislature, will be in force on our territory. The deputy prefect will be an Armenian, and this will protect the interests of the Armenian population. We do not want confrontation with either Armenia or Azerbaijan. In general, we must avoid confrontation in Transcaucasus, for this benefits only the Kremlin.

On Hopes for Independent Georgia

PM2202134391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 91 p 1

[Interview with Georgian Supreme Soviet Chairman Z. Gamsakhurdia by Pavel Voshchanov; place and date not given: "Zviad Gamsakhurdia: 'I Will Cross the Threshold of the Kremlin Only As a Citizen of Free Georgia!'"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] We are continuing to introduce the "top people" from the republics in our pages. The presidents and heads of legislatures of many of them have already expressed their own position in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. This position has not always coincided with that of the editorial board, but we have subscribed to the principle that readers must know the viewpoint of the head of a sovereign republic. The following interview with Georgian Supreme Soviet Chairman Z. Gamsakhurdia is, at the same time, also our reply to the letter from T. Sigua, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, who believes that Soviet periodicals "endeavor to portray exclusively in a negative light the processes taking place in Georgia along the road of restoring its... sovereignty."

[Voshchanov] Gamsakhurdia is said to be no novice at politics. How did this happen? After all, you never previously worked in any state or party structures.

[Gamsakhurdia] It all began back at school. There I created my first patriotic organization and issued my first proclamation. There, in 1956, I was arrested for the first time, along with eight of my comrades....

[Voshchanov] I can imagine how this shocked your family. After all, your father was a well known scholar and academician. Then all of a sudden his son is arrested for anti-Soviet activity....

[Gamsakhurdia] There was no shock. In general my father was to some extent our ideological mentor. I would go further—our initiator. Although he subsequently regretted this, as we found ourselves in great danger. Literally at every interrogation we were threatened in the following terms: "Now you are going to molder in jail. Then you will go to Siberia. So it will be a while before you get back home, guys. If you ever do...." Had it not been for the efforts of Georgian writers and scholars, I think that is exactly what would have happened. I believe it is only thanks to them we ended up with just a few months in jail, and then suspended sentences.

[Voshchanov] But how serious was all this? Was this not merely children playing at politics? After all, such things were also encountered in our country. Such "games" cost many a shattered life....

[Gamsakhurdia] It was not a game. It was all very serious. We realized both the extent of the danger and the extent of the responsibility. In general the mid-fifties were a time of intellectual ferment in Georgia, partly as a result of the Stalinist movement. Young people at that time protested out of a sense of national pride when they saw how Stalin was reviled....

[Voshchanov] So you decided to go to his defense by heading processes of spontaneous protest among young people?

[Gamsakhurdia] On the contrary. The aim was totally different—not to immortalize Stalin, not to extol him, but to restore an independent Georgian state. We were a small handful of people, but this was the start of a movement.... As for Stalin, I want to say the following: It is a mistake to stress this man's Georgian nationality. He was a product of totalitarianism. Like every dictator and tyrant, he had no nationality. It is no accident that our people was one of those that suffered most. I have opposed Stalin all my life.

[Voshchanov] Did that attitude toward Stalin not swell the ranks of your opponents? People in some republics of the Union are convinced that to this day this name is uttered in Georgia with emotion and even reverence....

[Gamsakhurdia] Stalinism was indeed strong here a few years ago. Today it practically does not exist. Only people with an extremely low level of culture or political adventurists continue to go on about his greatness.... They know just one thing: Stalin was a Georgian. Judge for yourselves: In the last elections to the republic's supreme soviet the Society for the Defense of Stalin suffered total failure. Their representatives were not even included on the electoral lists....

[Voshchanov] Your many speeches show that you are a convinced anticommunist. But as Supreme Soviet chairman you must conduct a dialogue with various political parties, including the Communist Party. Do you not sense a contradiction between your personal convictions and your state role?

[Gamsakhurdia] I have already repeatedly heard people say: Why make a show of your anticommunism? This only swells the ranks of your opponents, they argue. But, you see, I cannot do otherwise—that would be double-dealing. You cannot deceive yourself and your own people—there is no more bitter fate, there is no more terrible crime. I regard the CPSU as responsible for the calamities that my people (like all the peoples of the Soviet empire) have experienced over the last 70 years and more.... You speak of dialogue. I am prepared for it. Not only with communists, but with any other political party. But what is there to discuss? In the time I have been working in this office the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has addressed me regarding only one matter—the Central Committee administrative building. It looks as though nothing else bothers them. Not to mention the fact that the tone of these discussions is simply impermissible. Hardly do they become pointed before there are immediately threats: "We will call out the airborne troops!"

[Voshchanov] Do you regard that kind of development of events as realistic?

[Gamsakhurdia] I do not think so. At least for the present. After all, here the conditions are somewhat different, the social and political environment is different from Lithuania, say. The CPSU has no support in Georgia today. In the Baltic republics the communists' main gamble is on splitting the Russian-speaking population from the national liberation movement and kindling conflict between them. But we are supported not only by the majority of the Georgian people. My contention is that the majority of Russians living in Georgia are also on our side. Of course, the situation in South Ossettia and Abkhazia is somewhat different—there the CPSU has managed to find the support that is so necessary in order to combat us.

If you take your cue from such reports, then all we are doing here is destroying friendship among the peoples inhabiting Georgia. Allegedly our watchword is "Georgia for the Georgians!" and we are oppressing nonindigenous people. Unfortunately, information from us does not find its way into the pages of central publications, and people believe this rubbish.... Our newspapers recently published my speech concerning South Ossettia—three newspaper pages. The facts, historical information—can you quote all this in a short conversation? Unfortunately, Russians know neither the history nor the essence of this ethnic conflict.... But I think it is important to be aware of its political essence: The kindling of conflict in South Ossettia plays into the hands of those who have set themselves the main aim of preventing the restoration of an independent Georgian state at all costs.

[Voshchanov] In your view, who now really exercises state power in South Ossettia?

[Gamsakhurdia] Absolutely noone. Armed people, bandits, are driving around and literally terrorizing the population—not just the Georgian population, incidentally. A considerable share of the blame for this lies with the Army. We have many facts proving its cooperation with destructive forces. I recently reported some of them to the USSR president.... Tell me how the actions of servicemen—officer A. Poleshchuk and warrant officer Ye. Starodubtsev—who, disguised in guerrilla uniform and masks, attacked a Georgian MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] post and fired on it with assault rifles should be described? What about the fact that separatist leaders T. Kulumbegov and A. Chochiyev often take refuge from pursuit at the airborne regiment's base? To this day we have received no clear answer to the question of who is supplying the extremist gangs with rockets and ammunition. I wrote the president about this in literally the following terms: You get the impression that in

Tskhinvali everything is taking place according to the Lithuanian and Latvian scenario.

[Voshchanov] During our conversation you have repeatedly used the word "national".... Are you a nationalist?

[Gamsakhurdia] I am a patriot. But that is the emotional side of my convictions. If you look at my ideological platform, I am a Christian democrat. I advocate the creation of a legislative democratic republic in Georgia. Under such a form of state structure can any problems of one nation be resolved by infringing the rights of another, nonindigenous nation? Of course not. When we were just starting the struggle Russia's best people—the democratic intelligentsia and the democratic clergy—were on our side. We acted together. Almost all Russian samizdat was printed here in Georgia and spread from here throughout the Union and abroad.... But today some people in the center would very much like to plant suspicion in the hearts of Russian people: Are these not fascists who have come to power in Georgia?

[Voshchanov] Have you never wanted to meet with M.S. Gorbachev and try to elaborate principles for the Union's future relations with Georgia?

[Gamsakhurdia] As chairman, I have never crossed the threshold of the Kremlin. That is not pure chance. That is a stand. I will cross it only as a citizen of a free Georgia. I have repeatedly said to Gorbachev in this regard: You cannot talk about sovereign republics and treat them like stupid children who need constant tutelage and their father's belt! The Union cannot be renewed on the basis of such principles of communication. In this connection we all have great hopes of Russia and Yeltsin. We know how hard things are for him now—maybe harder than they are for any of us. The whole assault is aimed at him. How can we help this man? There is just one hope—he knows how to fight. But nevertheless it is worrying. Especially as reactionary forces are probably on the offensive at the center.

[Voshchanov] Shevardnadze's statement that he was resigning in protest at the approaching dictatorship riveted the attention of the whole population upon him....

[Gamsakhurdia] I take a somewhat different view of this. I think that what prompted him to take this action is what has always prompted him—the will of the Kremlin. Of course, Shevardnadze's statement caused a rumpus both inside the country and abroad. But... at the same time, it helped Gorbachev. After all, many Union deputies had gone to the congress to battle against the president, but after the foreign minister's statement they forgot about this and spoke of nothing else.

[Voshchanov] Some readers may have a suspicion that Gamsakhurdia is saying this because he is afraid Shevardnadze will return to Georgia....

[Gamsakhurdia] Certainly not. Let us consider this: What positions will Shevardnadze espouse if he does nevertheless return to Georgia? I personally believe they will be the same as always—pro-Kremlin positions. Does he have any chance of winning people over? None, I believe.

[Voshchanov] What worries you most of all today? What priority tasks face you?

[Gamsakhurdia] I am worried by the criminal gangs. I am worried by the fact that the mafia groupings have aligned themselves with unsuccessful politicians and are operating under the banner of the fight for independence and duping people. We must complete the formation of structures of state power. We must end the chaos and anarchy reigning in a number of rayons of Georgia. We must feed and clothe people, and that means a new economy.... In short, there are plenty of concerns and worries. The only thing that is lacking is time.

Gamsakhurdia Comments Said To Harm Stability

PM0503162591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report by special correspondents G. Ovcharenko and S. Cheremin "Letters From Georgia": "Anxiety Without Hope?"]

[Text] Tbilisi, 28 Feb—Ears were popping as usual when the tiny voice of the stewardess came over the intercom: "In a few minutes the aircraft will be landing at Tbilisi airport...."

We peer through the evening gloom, trying to catch a glimpse of the city below. But the usual welcome from the twinkling lights of advertisements and from the brightly lit streets and avenues of the republic's capital was lacking. We were later to find out why: There is an electricity shortage. One-half of the 240 major enterprises have shut down and, to save electricity, the working day has been cut in departments and institutions, and television broadcasts have been restricted to five hours a day—so how is one supposed to get the boulevards strung with glittering tinsel at night. Why indeed? The streets of this formerly pulsating and bustling city are now empty in the evenings. The impression is that Tbilisi is strangely anxious, worried, and suspicious....

It is, of course, impossible in just a few hours not only to unravel, but even to comprehend the whole knot of problems currently besetting the republic. You also have the one-sided position—uncompromisingly one-sided in many respects—of the new Georgian Supreme Soviet, a power struggle among a multitude of different parties (according to the local press, there are now around 120 of them), the bloody events in South Ossetia, thousands of refugees, tens of thousands of people forced out of employment, and the threat, we were told, of an incipient economic blockade of the republic.

Unfortunately, we did not get to meet with Z. Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Republic of Georgia Supreme

Soviet: A Georgian legislative session began yesterday and he did not feel like meeting with journalists. We say this without irony. Judging by the press, Zviad Konstantinovich is well aware of the role of the media and is not loathe to give interviews and hold news conferences. One was held for Soviet and foreign journalists just before we arrived. I think the rather frank statements made by Z. Gamsakhurdia give an idea of his stance and in many ways explain the complex situation in the republic. We will cite just a few of them:

"...The center is reacting strongly to the processes taking place in Georgia. It can be said that the center has actually declared war on us. War by all possible means—blockade, in particular power and food blockade, internal destabilization, mobilization of its agents, and intensification of actions against us.... At every step we are encountering a civil war situation, particularly in Samachablo (South Ossetia—Correspondents)."

"The center is struggling against Georgia, relying on its own troops and Ossetian extremists, but it is being portrayed as an ethnic conflict...."

"...With the help of the so-called South Ossetian conflict, Moscow is preparing to mount intervention in Georgia as a whole and to introduce presidential rule and a state of emergency throughout Georgia."

"...Incidentally, the Abkhaz are trying to unite the peoples of the North Caucasus against us, but they are getting nowhere...."

You will agree that these pronouncements by the new Georgian leader scarcely contributes to political and economic stabilization. Z. Gamsakhurdia is echoed by most republican publications. The "hand of Moscow," "KGB intrigues," "blockade," sabotage" and similar terms from the days of the struggle against cosmopolitanism and "alien ideas" can be found in publication after publication. There is not a whiff of pluralism in the majority of local papers, judging by what we read. The feeling is that it is all prepared in one enormous editorial office and is then sent out to the local media, who have to publish it. It appears that the "diktat of the partocracy" has been replaced by the diktat of the Georgian Supreme Soviet and its leader Z. Gamsakhurdia.

The empty evening streets of the republic's capital are also the result of a sharp increase in crime in the past two years. People are simply afraid to go out after dark.

The militia has not been doing its proper job of late," Deputy Internal Affairs Minister R. Gventsadze believes. "Instead of catching criminals we have been keeping order at numerous rallies, demonstrations, and marches. Then the illegal armed formations appeared, thinking they have the right to plunder, rob, blackmail, and even kill, under cover of political slogans. Now we have the conflict in South Ossetia...."

It is true, though, according to Roman Levanovich, who has gone from criminal imnvestigation inspector to deputy minister and whose knowledge of crime is not based on movies, the situation should improve somewhat in the very near future: The most serious measures are being adopted to combat the criminal world, with the backing of the republican leadership. But if one takes a realistic look at the situation in the republic, one is skeptical about this optimism. Indeed, the increase in crime is due to socioeconomic reasons, a relaxation of authority, and unemployment. All these are sore points in Georgia today. Suffice it to say that there are nearly 350,000 people out of work here at the moment.

So is there an actual economic blockade of the republic? We tried to get an answer from G. Davlianidze, chairman of the Tbilisi City Soviet Executive Committee planning commission:

"Judge for yourselves," Guram Shioyevich said. "In December electricity supplies to Tbilisi were 7.5 million kilowatt-hours short and in January they were 20 million short; the number nine unit at the Tbilisi State Regional Electric Power Station stands idle because of a gas supply shortfall; many enterprises, plants, and factories have shut down. As a result, the volume of production in Tbilisi fell in January by 88 million rubles compared with the same month last year.

There have been problems with gas and electricity supplies at this time of the year in Georgia before although not on this scale. In our view, the Georgian economy, and the country's entire economy for that matter, is a kind of litmus paper, reacting to political instability, the breakdown of interrepublican links, and a disastrous decline in contract discipline. Is this the situation in which to add fuel to the fire, kindle interethnic enmity, and provoke dissatisfaction with the center? Or is it a tactic people are using in an attempt to shift the blame onto someone else? In that case, should someone not tell people the truth? For example, should the communists not do this...?

We talked about this with D. Mikeladze, the new first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee. He has been in the post for literally a few days. As he sees it, his task is to consolidate the party, recover its authority and get it to cooperate with everyone who is acting for the good of the republic and of people.

"The Georgian Communist Party," Dzhelal Pridonovich said, "is a legislative party. Even now, I believe, it is well placed in the republican Supreme Soviet, one-third of whose deputies are communists. We will be able to defend our viewpoint and find ways of consolidating healthy forces."

Well, Georgian Communists have difficult times ahead of them. Particularly as Z. Gamsakhurdia made it quite clear to the magazine OGONEK in an interview: "The Communist Party is one of the faces of the mafia; we do not even regard it as a party, but rather as agents on foreign soil. Our aim is to abolish this party."

Having completed our notes, we fly to Tskhinvali today. But yesterday we talked with Japanese television journalists who had returned fromn the city the day before. Their minibus had been shot at there. Why? What for?

...Tomorrow is the first day of spring. Tbilisi is greeting it with anxiety and hope, but with more anxiety than hope.

Prosecutor's Ruling on Tbilisi Killings Decried

PM1103110191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Mar 91 p 1

[Report by L. Nikitinskiy, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA observer for legal questions: "Casualties Yes, Crimes No"]

[Text] According to INTERFAX, USSR General Prosecutor N. Trubin has sent a note to the USSR Supreme Soviet regarding the results of the investigation into events in Tbilisi 9 April 1989. The investigation has concluded that the officials who decided to halt the rally did not foresee that servicemen would meet with resistance.

In deciding the fate of the criminal case instituted in respect of the deaths of 19 people, the prosecutor's office—as always in such cases—"viewed" the objective facts established in the course of the investigation in the light of subjective blame. Blame in the form of criminal negligence consists in the subject's "failing to foresee the socially dangerous consequences of his actions in a case where he should and could have foreseen them."

Otherwise you have a moot case. "Inability to foresee" is possible both due to objective external circumstances (lack of information, for instance) and due to inexperience.

It can only be the latter when assessing the actions in Tbilisi. The outward train of events was quite clearly "discernible," and only extreme incompetence could have resulted in the "officials who decided to halt the rally" with troops "failing to foresee the consequences thereof."

Can these "officials" continue to command armed formations? We would suggest that the USSR Supreme Soviet—within the framework of its discussion of the above note from the USSR prosecutor general—consider the question of directing the "officials..." into some more peaceful work. Supervision of children's creches, for instance.

Ossetia Interethnic, Economic Crises Continue

PM1303162391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by S. Aleksandrov: "South Ossetia: War Continues"]

[Text] USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] reports from rayons in South Ossetia still begin with the same words: "The up-to-the-minute situation remains complex."

IZVESTIYA was told at the USSR MVD Press Bureau that the latest data from the area of armed interethnic conflict are not at all comforting. At roughly 1800 hours 9 March unknown persons opened fire in the area of the village of Khetagurovo. One Ossetian was killed and another wounded.

At the same time, unknown persons in the village of Vanege fired on an automobile carrying Georgian militia personnel. Four militiamen were taken to Gori City Hospital with firearms wounds.

The economic blockade of Tskhinvali continues. Enterprises are nonoperational due to lack of raw materials, and electricity supplies are intermittent. Repair and restoration work is continuing on the pipeline. Obstructions on the highway through Dzhava have not been cleared either. The bakery is only producing 20 percent of its output.

The mass media have quoted in some detail from Zviad Gamsakhurdia's speech at a news conference at the republic legislature. Attention is drawn to the Georgian leader's ideas on the conflict in South Ossetia. "The whole world should finally know that the war in so-called South Ossetia is nothing more than the center's war against Georgia."

POSTFACTUM reports that Georgian legislative newspapers have published a background memorandum from the republic's MVD which, citing available up-to-the-minute information, gives the names of 37 people who are members of Ossetian quasi-military formations. The report provides personal information and their noms de guerre, along with the names of 10 leaders of the Ossetian fighters.

Central Asia

Kazakh President Discusses Referendum Question

LD1303121691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0500 GMT 13 Mar 91

[Interview with Nursultan Abishevich Nazarbayev, Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic president, by correspondent (Dokesh Bayembetov) in Alma-Ata; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [(Bayembetov)] We have our special features. Teli us about these features. How calmly do you think this referendum will proceed in the republic?

[Nazarbayev] The Fourth Congress of People's Deputies decided to hold an all-Union referendum, as you know. It is written in the congress decision that the referendum will be held in the republics, and the results will be

counted by the republics. But it is written in the Constitution that a referendum in a republic can be held only by decision of the Supreme Soviet of each republic. Following the constitution, the Supreme Soviet of our republic suported the holding of an all-Union referendum on this issue. It has formulated its own question: Do you consider essential the preservation of the USSR as a union of equal sovereign states?

The text proposed by the USSR Supreme Soviet and by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies is not clear to people in many respects. If you reply to the question for the USSR, there then follows the word federative, and you have to reply yes or no to that, too; then come rights and liberties—that also needs a yes or no. In other words, one question on top of another introduces confusion. That is the point. For this reason we consider it a Union referendum, and it is in line with the adopted declaration on the sovereignty of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. I call on all the people of Kazakhstan to vote on precisely this formulation. We have agreed with the USSR president, with the leader of the Supreme Soviet, and with academics and legal experts in Moscow that this does not contravene the Union referendum and that it will be valid as a Union referendum for the preservation of the USSR.

Kazakhstan Changes Referendum Question Wording

LD1203192191 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 12 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulagin]

[Text] Alma-Ata March 12 TASS—Kazakhstan has become the only republic in the country to change the wording of the question brought up for an all-union referendum on the future of the USSR.

By a decision of the republican parliament, the wording reads: "Do you consider it necessary to preserve the USSR as a union of equal sovereign states?"

The word "republics" was replaced by the word "states". Besides, the notions of a renewed federation, rights and freedoms of the individual of every nationality have also been left out.

Deputies proceeded from the assumption that the draft Union treaty concerning the sovereign subjects of the federation uses the categories of both republics and states. But preference has been given to the latter, since it conforms to the status of republican independence to a greater extent.

As far as the federation, rights and freedoms are concerned, the republican parliament deputies believe that these notions have already been reflected in the draft Union treaty and in the declaration of the state sovereignty of Kazakhstan.

The parliamentarians were supported by Republican President Nursultan Nazarbayev. He believes that Kazakhstan has on the whole already given an affirmative answer to the question brought up for the referendum.

Since decisions to hold the referendum are taken by republican parliaments, it was deemed possible here to avoid the unwieldy wording and focus people's attention on the main thing. This by no means signifies a "war of laws".

Practically everything is ready for the referendum in the republic. The central commission, 21 area and 10,500 district commissions for organising and holding the refferendum are functioning in the republic. They involve about 86,000 people. Voting lists include almost 9.7 million people.

New Kazakh 'Democratic Bloc' Formed, Reviewed

LD1303041691 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 12 Mar 91

[Text] In Kazakhstan a democratic bloc has been set up by the parties in opposition to the government of the republic. Our reporter Leonid Zhukov, recently back from that part of the country, has the details.

[Zhukov] The democratic bloc has united four political parties and two organizations and represents a broad spectrum of the republic's political thought. Three of the parties have platforms based on national democratic principles. Another is a radical Islamic party. Then there is the international human rights committee of Kazakhstan and another radical Islamic association. As to the purpose of this coalition, here is what I was told by (Shurak Arabayev), a secretary of the moderately radical Zholtaksan Party.

[Begin (Arabayev) recording in Russian with superimposed translation to English] At the beginning of this year, I appealed to all the democratic forces in Alma-Ata, the capital of our Republic, to unite. At a meeting of our party in January I urged cordinating our activities in view of the increasingly dictatorial stance of the government of our Republic. Each of the parties and associations joining the democratic bloc has its own subdivisions in the Republic. We want to harness this huge potential to achieve our aims. [end recording]

[Zhukov] (Shurak Arabayev) of Zholtaksan Party in Kazakhstan. The political stand of that party is close to that of the Azadselik movement, which is committed to bulding up a democratic multiethnic republic. Both parties practice similar methods as well. (Shurak Arabayev) again.

[Begin (Arabayev) Recording] The activities of our party, like those of the Azadselik movement, are mainly based on parliamentary methods, though sometimes we do organize or take part in rallies or hunger strikes. That's why we are often labelled neo-Bolsheviks by some government authorities. True, we do sometimes use

extrme methods, but we resort to them only when we feel there's no other way to get the authorities to tackle certain issues. I believe that in the future when all three parties, including the Social Democrats, focus on common problems of a national character, we are certain to become a single party. [end recording]

[Zhukov] (Shurak Arabayev) of the Kazakh Zholtaksan Party. In the Kazakh parliament an overwhelming majority of seats belongs to the Communist Party of the republic, led by Nursultan Nazarbayev, who is at the same time the president of the republic. What makes the rating of the Communist Party in Kazakhstan extremely high as compared to that of its counterparts in the other republics is the authority of its leader, Nazarbayev, and progressive policies, espcially in the economic sphere, worked out by his team. This was explained to me by (Konstantin Zhigalev) of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee.

[Begin (Zhigalev) recording in Russian with superimposed translation to English] Thanks to President Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan has clear-cut and stable domestic policies. And not only that. Its foreign policies, too, bear the same distinctive features. The Central Committee of the Republic's Communist Party coordinates its work with the presidential structures, tackling the Republic's problems. That's why at the moment we are working together with most of the opposition parties. [end recording]

[Zhukov] (Konstantin Zhigalev) of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee. Indeed, President Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan has become a most popular political leader in the Soviet Union. He was among the first to urge all the Soviet republics to back the new treaty of the Union, and he has advocated a common market in Central Asia. So it seems like the political center in this country has moved to the Central Asian area.

Kazakh President's Decree on Draftee Protection

PM0703113191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Oleg Stefashin report under "Direct Line" rubric: "Guaranteeing Protection of Soldiers"]

[Text] N. Nazarbayev, the president of the republic, has formed a special commission to ensure the objectivity of all investigations into instances of death, injury, and violation of the rule of law with regard to army conscripts from Kazakhstan.

Commenting on the president's decree at the request of the AZIYAPRESS news agency, Yu. Khitrin, Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] state counselor on questions of state and law, noted that the commission's main purpose is to place the personnel education activity of the military under the control of the people and their authorized representatives, their deputies. The need for this is greater now than ever before. Discipline in the Army, by all accounts, is declining rapidly. The commission's work should lead to a stabilization of the situation. The main thing, Khitrin stated, is that wherever Kazakhs are serving—in their own republic or elsewhere—they will now feel constantly that their life, honor, and dignity are reliably protected by the laws of the Kazakh SSR and its president.

Kazakh Trade Unions Plan 'Protest' 30 March

PM0703145391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent O. Stefashin: "Trade Unions Preparing Protest Action"]

[Text] The Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Trade Union Federation Council has declared its readiness to hold a republic-wide protest action 30 March. The explanations given at an extraordinary plenum of the federation noted that the action would primarily be directed against the republic's government and Supreme Soviet, which are ignoring trade unions' proposals on the social protection of the population. The social and political situation could significantly deteriorate in connection with the expected price rises, and this must not be allowed to happen, of course. The trade union leaders believe that it is necessary to immediately set about indexing the population's incomes and introducing compensation payments before embarking on a market economy.

It is assumed, IZVESTIYA correspondent O. Stefashin reports, that during the warning strike planned for 30 March the population will actively support the so-called "trade union version" of social protection of the population.

Kazakh, Uzbek Presidents Discuss Joint Policies

LD0203224691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1545 GMT 2 Mar 91

[Report by correspondent D. Baimbetov on a meeting in Chimkent Oblast between the presidents of the Kazakh and Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republics [SSR], including recorded remarks by I.A. Karimov, president of the Uzbek SSR, and N.A. Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Baimbetov] The discussions covered a wide range of topics: the intensification of cultural contacts; the creation of joint enterprises; the fulfillment of a bilateral treaty on widening economic links; and also, for example, a matter of concern above all to residents of the border areas of Tashkent and Chimkent Oblasts—they will now be able to purchase goods and food without restrictions, both on their own territory and on that of their neighbors. Matters having to do with the forthcoming referendum and the new Union treaty, and others, were of course also raised.

[Karimov] We are dealing above all with the difficult period called the transition to the market. To be more specific, there will be an increase in prices—if not today, then tomorrow. That is no secret to anyone. Alongside the price increases, we are also making provision today for questions to do with the social protection of people. We want to ease this through joint efforts, because it is not an easy task. It is far from easy.

[Nazarbayev] Certain central departments are inclined to go back, as it were. They are nostalgic for the diktat that existed before. Our republics have adopted sovereignty declarations. As you will know, that is not something the leaders of the republics have dreamed up. It is the expression of the will of the people via the Supreme Soviets. In order to defend these sovereignties properly, and to give them real substance, we must work out a joint policy. This policy does not envisage any destructive actions at all. Both of our republics are firmly in favor of the Union , but a different Union, renewed and based on recognition of the sovereignty of the republics in a union of sovereign states.

Uzbek CP Plenum Discusses Referendum, Other Issues

PM1403112191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondents V. Artemenko and A. Kaipbergenov under the "Official" rubric: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] Tashkent, 12 Mar—A routine Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Plenum held here has discussed practical steps to implement the republic Communist Party's action program. Uzbek President I. Karimov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report.

The plenum urged all Communists and every inhabitant of the republic to vote on referendum day, 17 March—both on the main ballot paper and on the additional ballot paper—in favor of a unified Union of sovereign republics.

In accordance with the Law "On Public Associations in the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]" and guided by Paragraph 22 of the CPSU Statutes and the decisions of the 22d Uzbek Communist Party Congress, the plenum deemed it necessary to register the Uzbek Communist Party Statutes.

The plenum's participants agreed with the findings of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Bureau on the advisability of organizing a V.I. Lenin republic museum of history and friendship between the peoples of Uzbekistan based on the Tashkent branch of the Central V.I. Lenin Museum and the Museum of History of the Peoples of Uzbekistan. The Central Committee Bureau has been tasked with coordinating this question with the CPSU Central Committee.

In the report "We Trust Communists..." 16 January this year PRAVDA described the work of the Almalyk Gorkom [City Party Committee] and its first secretary A. Abduvasikov. At today's plenum he was elected by a majority vote as member of the Central Committee, member of the Bureau, and secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee.

President Karimov Discusses Uzbek Concerns

PM1203123591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 91 p 1

[Interview with I.A. Karimov, president of Uzbekistan and first secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee, by A. Alimov and A. Mursaliyev; place and date not given: "'We Have Been Taught to Leapfrog Capitalism'"]

[Text] [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Islam Abduganiyevich, your republic is sometimes called a "communist sanctuary." How fair is this appraisal of Uzbekistan and what is your attitude towards it?

[Karimov] Much is said about the conservatism of our thinking and about how we are the bulwark of the communist outlook. You can only give a correct appraisal of the situation if you know the region's history. Through all the years of Soviet power, Uzbekistan in essence never had its own statehood. However, the advertising message everywhere was that we had arrived at socialism, skipping the painful stage of capitalism. But in essence we were a most terrible semblance of it. Though we had come to believe that socialism really had been built, and was no worse than elsewhere. Moreover, people from countries starting off on the noncapitalist way of development were still being invited, and attempts were made using our experience to teach them how to leapfrog capitalism. Today all this seems primitive...

At one time, someone had had the thought that Uzbekistan should ensure the country a self-sufficiency in cotton. The "white gold" was obtained by the most brutal methods. Those who did not agree were pushed to one side or removed, and people were picked who would obediently say: "Let us catch up and overtake them," "let us fulfill the 5-Year Plan in two years." The only place where cotton was not sown were the windowsills and roofs. We provided self-sufficiency in cotton. But we ourselves acquired a dependent economy. Everything was done to secure one aim: to serve the cotton industry. Today there are insufficient goods here, and we bring in more than half of them from outside...

As for the "bulwark" business... That's all rubbish. We are a country with an ancient culture which provided mankind with outstanding scientists, humanists, and philosophers. A country with such a history, which, by the way, people at one time tried to consign to oblivion, cannot be a center for conservative forces.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] You've painted a very gloomy picture. Is there a way out of this situation and what do you think it is?

[Karimov] Without making a truthful analysis and determining the true state of affairs, it is impossible to find a way out. We have taken the following route. We say openly: Yes, Uzbekistan's national income today and the population's living standards are among the lowest in the country. And yet Uzbekistan is a rich republic. We have everything. On the one hand rich resources—all the elements in Mendeleyev's periodic table—and on the other a surfeit of manpower resources; around 600,000 people do not have a permanent job.

How can this be rectified? We don't have to reinvent the wheel, we need to make use of the experience of the countries of East Asia. We could agree to put up with things for another five years, but we need foreign technology and machinery, and compact enterprises nearer to where people live. We need to send as many of our boys and girls to the leading countries so that they see the world with their own eyes and become familiar with this technology. Let them put up with things and work a bit there; in return they come back completely different people...

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Are you talking about exporting manpower?

[Karimov] Yes. There should be no restrictions. Let them go off and learn about any ideology, any technical equipment or technology. It is said that if we sell cotton and raw materials, we can sit back and do nothing for five years or so. I do not agree with this at all, because no country which thinks about its future generations can live from the sale of its raw material resources. Foreign countries are ready to come to our aid. We already have a pile of offers worth nigh on a billion dollars. The most important thing is to create joint enterprises, the base which will nurture completely new people here in the future. And then all talk about conservatism and backwardness will die away of its own accord.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] At the very beginning, however, the countries of East Asia had one more not unimportant attribute, apart from raw materials and manpower resources—production relations somewhat different from ours...

[Karimov] We declared in our Law on Ownership that all forms of ownership are equal in Uzbekistan. There are already independent enterprises founded on new principles. We are trying to transform ministries into concerns. Other forms of ownership are not excluded—private and joint-stock ownership. But I am in favor of introducing privatization in stages. We should complete one stage, show its advantages, and then go on to the next.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Of course the prospects for the future here are impressive. But what has actually been done during your presidency?

[Karimov] It was I who for the first time said from the highest tribune that there are more than 9 million people living below the poverty line, that about 47 percent of the population are children in need of special care, that mortality here is among the highest in the country. When we began to tell the truth, the people followed us.

But words are not everything. The decree on land resolved an immense problem. I unequivocally said: "We are reducing cotton production by 700,000 tonnes, representing 250,000-300,000 hectares. I put the question to the Union organs of power and the country's Gosplan [State Planning Committee] in the following way: You prescribe what you like, but I will not carry it out. When they understood that we had reached our limit, they helped to resolve these questions. We gave people 165,000 hectares, and increased peasants' landholdings almost twofold. People's interest picked up. What attracted the peasants to the Revolution? The slogan "Land for the Peasants!" Now we are providing all the conditions so there can be livestock in every yard. We have created the Association of Personal Plot Owners, who are our future farmers. In our republic 40 percent of food is produced in the individual sector, whose land accounts for a mere six percent of the total irrigated area. There was more or less no problem in our bazaars this year. The 165,000 hectares did their stuff...

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Islam Abduganiyevich, what do you judge the state of interethnic relations to be in your republic?

[Karimov] The events in Fergana and everything that has happened in recent times have given rise to mistrust between people of the various nationalities. Who was behind all this? I can now unequivocally say: The center for all this is located outside the republic.

Some people find it very necessary to have the Union republics in a state of uncertainty during the period of transition to market relations... In a situation where it is possible to interfere at any moment, and anything at all can be decided.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Recently there has been much talk of a Turkistan union. The talk became more frequent particularly after the meeting of the Turkistan republics' leaders in Alma-Ata last summer...

[Karimov] I consider our meeting in Alma-Ata to have been logical and objective. We cannot live side by side and at the same time not be linked economically. At the moment we are scratching our right ear with our left hand. The grain which could be brought to us from Kazakhstan in exchange for our raw materials is brought in from five centers. Why? Because this is necessary to Gosplan. Some guy sits in his office and says: Take a bit from the Ukraine, a bit from Altay, a bit from Kazakhstan... But then why is Gosplan necessary if everything is going to happen of its own accord? But, it turns out that there is another side, a flip side to this. There are people who have the idea of creating Greater Turan. They, in their turn, used the meeting to rouse such

feelings in people. These people understand nothing, neither about history nor about the current situation. The Tajiks are already worried that the larger Republic of Uzbekistan will infringe on their interests. The conflict which took place in Kirghizia surely points to something? History cannot be turned back. We can talk about a community in Central Asia. Here, the borders between the republics are a very explosive question. They were drawn, you might say, in an artificial manner at the time...

I must also mention the positive role which Kazakhstan is playing as unifier. It is worthy of every kind of approval and recognition.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] An opposition has appeared in the new republic legislature. Do you sense its presence? Does it help the work of the legislature?

[Karimov] Were it a healthy opposition which had its own ideas, understanding, and view of the future, I would welcome it. But if we are talking of those I have run into and had to debate with, it is absolutely clear: The majority of them are straining for power. Give them a place in the sun, and they'll relax and forget the people. And they'll turn into conservatives who are worse than the present ones. The most arrogant ones are those who were at one time rejected by the system and base themselves today on "democracy" and "pluralism." While fighting against this system, they are happy to return to it and forget everything if it will allow them so to do.

But there is another opposition, which I would not call an opposition but a milieu. There are young people who want to live and work, who want to create something, do you understand? They do not tolerate lies. Among the deputies they see people who have been in prison twice, who live beyond their means, who say one thing yet do another. And they will accept none of this. It is necessary that they be given a favored status so they can take the key positions in our society.

There is not a single legislature in the world which is such a bazaar as ours. There is a kind of procedure when parties fight for seats in the legislature. It is terrible when each deputy waits to see who will buy him and his vote. Anything at all can be expected from from such a legislature. Therefore, I'm for a legislature in which all ideas, social strata, and interests are represented.